

THE
ECLECTIC REVIEW,
FOR APRIL, 1841.

Art. I. *Church Principles Considered in their Results.* By W. E. GLADSTONE, Esq., late Student of Christchurch and M.P. for Newark. London: Murray. 1840.

THIS is a curious book. It is an attempt to establish and illustrate the most prominent and dangerous of the high Church doctrines maintained by the Oxford Tract writers, not so much by historic evidence, the only evidence in favor of such extravagancies that would be worth a farthing, but principally by—what does the reader think? — *their antecedent probability!* their adaptation to the nature and the necessities of man and their harmony with the principles of the divine government! So that, as Bishop Butler's celebrated work was entitled 'The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and the Course of Nature,' Mr. Gladstone's ambitious volume might be entitled 'The Analogy of the Oxford Tract Doctrines of Church Authority, the Apostolical Succession, Sacramental Efficacy, &c., to the Constitution and the Course of Human Nature and of Divine Providence.' But alas! here all resemblance ceases. Wide, indeed, is the difference between the speculative and argumentative powers of the Bishop of Gloucester and those of the member for Newark; a difference as wide as that between the sublime truths established by the one and the miserably contracted and uncharitable doctrines propounded by the other.

Of all the publications of the Pusey school which have come under our notice, this is one of the weakest, and yet, strange to say, may be (to a certain class of readers) one of the most dangerous:

we mean to those who are not accustomed to think for themselves, or to ask the proper and sufficient evidence of whatever propositions are submitted to them. And this assuredly is no small class in a school which professedly defers rather to authority than reason, which makes many of its most peculiar and improbable mysteries dependent in no wise on logic, but simply on faith; and which, generally, errs rather on the side of believing too much than of believing too little.

To such men as those above adverted to, the present work will be dangerous on several grounds; first and chiefly, because it abounds in that well-known fallacy, humorously described by Whately, of stating something which is true, but which is really nothing to the purpose, as if it were decisive of the controversy; of stating with much pomp certain general principles which every body admits, leaving the incautious reader to take for granted that the particular point under discussion is involved in them, and to infer that because there is very little to which he objects, that therefore the author has proved his proposition. To illustrate by a single example. In a long, and in many parts affectedly metaphysical chapter, at the commencement of the work, entitled 'Rationalism,' there is really very little, till quite towards the close, to which any reader who admits the Scriptures to be true will take the slightest objection. It abounds with such truisms as these:—that there is a tendency in the human mind to reject mysteries which transcend the human understanding—that this reluctance is no sufficient reason for their rejection—that there is need of preternatural influences to correct the bias of our depraved affections—that the understanding alone will not suffice for this task—that the exhibition of doctrine, however true, is equally insufficient for it—and so forth; all which we suppose few persons would be disposed to deny. But the question still returns, even when we have admitted that there is a reluctance in the human understanding to receive mysteries which are above its comprehension,—what is the proper evidence, notwithstanding intrinsic difficulty or apparent incomprehensibleness, on which any particular mystery is worthy of being received in spite of the acknowledged tendency of human nature to reject it? When we argue with the Socinian, for example, we admit that the doctrine of the Trinity is indeed a most profound and incomprehensible mystery; but we receive it upon what we deem the sufficient evidence of revelation,—upon revelation based upon appropriate and sufficient proofs. We should never think it much to the purpose to adduce in support of the doctrine of the Trinity, the general reluctance to receive mysteries, except to remove a very faint presumption against it. After the general principle has been established, that it does not become us to

reject mysteries as such, the question as to what particular mysteries are worthy of belief is to be decided on entirely other grounds. To a reader of moderate sagacity, therefore, Mr. Gladstone's elaborately argued truisms will just go for nothing, until the principles on behalf of which they are adduced are established by appropriate evidence. Yet all such evidence Mr. Gladstone modestly disclaims all intention of adducing. He tells us 'the first, the most appropriate, and the highest 'mode of discussing the subject is the scientific process whereby 'these principles are deduced and proved from holy Scripture; ' * * * but let no one suppose in opening this volume that 'it pretends to repeat the process of demonstration upon these 'topics; for it, the reader must refer to other and easily accessible sources.' We must acknowledge that 'the process of 'demonstration,' as he calls it, and 'the scientific process by 'which these principles are deduced and proved from holy 'Scripture,' have never, in our opinion, been so satisfactorily performed as to exempt an advocate from the attempt to perform them with better success; and in particular we should much wish that Mr. Gladstone had tried his hand at the task, if only for the sake of neutralizing those dangerous plausibilities by which we fear unwary readers are liable to be misled; imagining, easy men! that they are put into possession of solid arguments for the particular doctrines contended for, while in fact they are merely put in possession of specious generalities which no one ever thought of denying. Thus there is many a weak man who, upon its being proved to him that it is no sufficient argument for the rejection of a mystery that it transcends the powers of the human understanding, would immediately suppose that there was no reason why he should not believe the mystery of the apostolical succession; and as many more who, upon its being shown that there was a need of preternatural influences to effect the great work of man's renovation, would straightway conclude that they had got hold of a very excellent reason why they should admit the terrible delusion of baptismal regeneration. Mr. Gladstone must know very well that amongst those who are willing to receive *such* a mystery as the Trinity, the grand objection to the doctrines of apostolical succession and baptismal regeneration, is not that they are *mysteries*, but that the proper and independent evidence of them is demanded, and is not forthcoming. As 'to the other and easily accessible 'sources,' to which Mr. Gladstone refers us, all we can say is, that we do not know where they are to be found; but we readily acknowledge that the method which Mr. Gladstone has adopted does great credit to his discretion; it is far more easy and far more plausible.

Secondly; we fear that with many readers of the Pusey

school (with whom a thing's being a mystery often seems to be not merely no objection, but a singular recommendation, and an antecedent ground of probability), the very appearance of metaphysical profundity and superfluous subtlety, which our author knows so well how to put on, will seem very imposing and conclusive. If they cannot understand, they can take for granted, and will be ready to believe that where there is so much smoke, there must be a great deal of fire; that such sentences as the following (and they will find whole pages of them), however unintelligible, involve some mystery or other—which though in reality very innocent, and as little connected with 'Church Principles' as with good writing, it behoves them devoutly to believe. 'This power of confidence, ' then, has a ground in the several departments of the mind; ' and the question, in which of the two it operates with the ' greater force, depends upon a larger one—that, namely, ' whether in general, or in the given case, or in both, the affections supply the subject matter and the movements of the ' individual character in a greater or less degree than the other ' faculties of his nature, his passions, his particular propensities, ' his lower desires. It is enough here to have shown that the ' work is a joint one; that confidence is operative on practice ' by substitution; and operative alike through the single action ' of mind, and through the double action of mind and heart: ' we might perhaps add, that third case, in which the heart ' prompts instinctive action without the perceptible intervention ' of the understanding in its instrumental capacity.' Surely the spirit of Plato's *Protagoras* must have transmigrated into the honorable member for Newark, or he must be inspired by those divinities in Aristophanes;

' Who pour down on us gifts of fluent speech,
Sense most sententious, wonderful for fine effect,
And how to talk about it and about it.'

Without pretending to give an analysis of the whole contents of Mr. Gladstone's book, with a great part of which, indeed, being perfectly true and nothing to the purpose, we have no manner of quarrel, we shall proceed to specify a few of the instances of his remarkable logic when he ventures to apply his indeterminate generalities to the establishment of his peculiar Church principles. The first shall be from that chapter on ' Rationalism' on which we have already made some remarks. He has rightly argued in that chapter for the necessity of some spiritual influence above and beyond human nature to secure the renovation of man. Now there is an obvious sense in which every Christian would be perfectly willing to subscribe to this

doctrine ; but then we affirm that the transcendent influence thus exerted acts immediately upon the understanding and the affections in concurrence with all the powers of our nature, and in perfect harmony with all the laws of our moral constitution ; that it is not a grace conveyed by inevitable necessity, on account of a rite performed by a certain individual ; conveyed without the slightest consciousness on the part of him who is subjected to it, and without the slightest proof to the bystanders that it has been conveyed ; an influence which leaves behind no appreciable trace, an influence, in fact, which influences nothing, and a cause which produces no effect. Yet it is such a sort of influence for which Mr. Gladstone earnestly contends ; it is the supposed influence implied in *baptismal regeneration* or in the *administration of the Lord's Supper at the hands of an episcopally ordained minister*. And how does the reader imagine Mr. Gladstone proceeds to show the inconsistency of our denying this species of influence, because we contend that the preternatural influence we admit is exerted only in harmony with the laws of our moral nature—that it implies the active concurrence of our minds and the spontaneous admission of our hearts ? Let us hear him.

‘ But we may call, and call loudly, upon those who have accustomed themselves to regard orthodoxy (in the sense specified) as the highest characteristic and surest guarantee of the Christian life, if they value either the truth of religion or the force and consistency of their own arguments, to join with us against rationalism in all its forms, and especially against that its subtlest form which teaches or assumes that spiritual life can only be initiated through an intellectual process. They denounce, and justly denounce, the idea of converting men by merely preceptive teaching : the truth of moral maxims and their intrinsic beauty, say they, may be unquestionable, but you present them to a being whose percipient faculties are corrupt, and who requires an antecedent spiritual influence to enable him to appreciate them. So far they are right ; but are they not incorrect in imagining that the presentation of doctrine to the understanding (for to the understanding in the first instance it presents itself) is the sole and sufficient guarantee divinely appointed for the realization of that spiritual influence ? If truth of a less immediately practical nature may convey it,—i. e. truth of doctrine, why may not the more immediately practical—i. e. the preceptive truth, convey it also ? Why may not the precept carry with it the power of its own accomplishment, as well as the doctrine carry with it the disposition for its own reception and likewise the power of accomplishing the precept ?

‘ If they establish a title as against Sacramental influences, which some may deride as mystical, they cannot establish one in sound argument against moral teaching, which they suspect as rationalistic ; for such a title must be grounded on the general prerogatives of truth ;

and on its affinity to the understanding, as subject matter to an instrument appointed for working on it. Such a title will evidently include moral teaching as a positive channel of grace; they cannot find any distinction which shall shut it out. Then will arise the danger which I have striven to exhibit; in the active and robust play of the intellect, the more delicate conception of divine influence will be lost. Why will they not use the security, which God in his wisdom has provided for them, by constructing separate vehicles of an influence quite distinct from the understanding, and therefore permanent witnesses of its independent essence?'—pp. 77, 78.

So, because we contend that the exhibition of the *peculiar doctrines* of the gospel is the necessary condition of realizing the *effects* of the gospel, we are incorrect, it seems, in denying that merely *preceptive* teaching, or the inculcation of matters, which, however true, *exclude by supposition* all the peculiar doctrines of the gospel, will not realize the same effects; which is as much as saying, that because we contend that a system of truth *must* be exhibited to produce the *effects* of that system, we are incorrect in denying that the same effect may be produced if all that is peculiar to that system be excluded! What shall we say to such a reasoner as this?—and yet into such fallacies as this Mr. Gladstone is continually falling.

Mr. Gladstone's third chapter, which is one of the longest in the book, is on the 'Church.' It is made up, for the most part, of the elaborate commonplace which nobody would think of disputing, sometimes expressed with needless prolixity, and something very like an affectation of metaphysical obscurity. But it is commonplace which has no power whatever to determine the controversies on this subject, as it may for the most part be adopted by all of every party who admit the social character of Christianity,—that it presupposes natural sympathy and joint action; in a word, it may be admitted with equal propriety by all who contend that there is a visible church *in any sense* or under any modifications. That 'every inward principle of our nature struggles for an outward development' as our author affectedly expresses it; that it seeks for this not only for its own consummation, but also that it may be expansive and communicative, to use again his own language; that Christianity very naturally and reasonably avails itself of this tendency; that all other religions, whether true or false, have ever been embodied in an outward development of rites and of social institutions; that in the case of Christianity it seems especially necessary, considering the obstacles with which this has to contend, and which can be overcome only by a firm and general resistance; that the religion of the individual is apt to decline if he be secluded from his fellows; that adoption into a body

tends to depress and absorb the idea of *self*; that sympathy is a principle which for the most part gives increased energy to action, and so on, all which propositions Mr. Gladstone proceeds to illustrate with as much pomp and tediousness as if they were now revealed to the world for the first time, will be admitted with equal readiness by the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian, or the Congregationalist, or by a Christian of any denomination whatsoever who admits that there is such a thing as a church of Christ or such things as churches of Christ at all. It is difficult to tell which to feel most strongly; contempt for the understanding which can imagine that such generalities really have any decisive bearing upon the controversy, or indignation at the unfairness which would leave it to be inferred that they have. We apprehend, however, that the latter would be the more reasonable emotion, for it is difficult to give Mr. Gladstone credit for so much obtuseness as not to know that all these plausible generalities may be admitted by the warmest opponents of his peculiar church principles. But he well knows that there are multitudes who will suppose that these are really arguments on his side of the question; that they are arguments which his opponents would not admit; and who would wonder to find how very reasonable all appears on the one side and how strangely unreasonable on the other; especially as he takes care to assume all the way through that the 'voluntary combinations which we perceive in sects around us,' as he expresses it, 'are simply so many *aftergrowths*, intended to supply the place of the primitive and legitimate idea of the church.' He also takes care to talk as if these voluntary combinations may be formed and dissolved at pleasure; whereas he ought to know and must know, that the Congregationalist, for example, while he contends that all combinations of Christians *must* be voluntary, in the sense that every member of it must be a *willing* member, yet as firmly believes that the combinations which Mr. Gladstone is pleased to call 'imperfect aftergrowths,' are truly churches of Christ, and that it is his duty to incorporate himself with them, as Mr. Gladstone believes in his figment of the one visible church. Whatever advantages, therefore, from sympathy, association, &c., attach to the one, also attach to the other; and hence, as we assert, the utter irrelevancy of Mr. Gladstone's pompous declamation on the above specified commonplace topics. His duty clearly was to prove his peculiar notion of the church to be the true one, or if he would insist only on the *a priori* probability that that idea was the true one, he should have abstained from appropriating arguments which are just as conclusive in behalf of any form of the church whatever. We have really no alternative but that of believing Mr. Gladstone to be either one of the most obtuse or one of the most

unfair of all reasoners. But let us proceed to investigate Mr. Gladstone's views of the 'Church.'

His notion is not merely that there is an *invisible* church of Christ to which all Christians in all ages belong, but that there is a *visible* church which is also strictly one, or which, as he expresses it, 'is called to unity.' Now all we have to ask is, which is that visible church? But here Mr. Gladstone at once deserts us.

'It is now time to pass onwards to another portion of this inquiry—to the endeavor, namely, to meet such objections to the foregoing principle as may probably be anticipated. First, let us obviate a misconception that is most likely to arise. There is no claim here made or implied for any particular local portion of the Church as such, to possess the high distinction of being invested in all minds with those plenary ideas of privilege and authority which belong in full only to the Church universal; the full measure of regard and deference to her as a parent and guide, as qualified to be regarded like parents with affection, like guides with confidence, is only due to the body which fulfils the idea of the catholic church of Christ. We need not now inquire what are the essential conditions of membership in that church, or what is necessary to constitute her unity—these are properly subsequent considerations. It may be that she has lost that virgin beauty and harmony of her form which adorned her youth, and that, so far, the affections she once riveted upon herself are now baffled and without a home; but we must not allow ourselves to be hindered in receiving the truth of Scripture by the anticipation of posterior difficulties, which, if they have arisen at all, will have arisen only out of our own misdeeds: the object here urged is, to aim at grasping and embodying in the first instance by effort (under divine grace), and then confirming by mental habit, an effectual conception of the church as a body within which we are comprehended, as that to which we belong rather than that she belongs to us; as a living admitted proof of the love of Christ to us, and as having the stewardship of his word and the ordinances of his grace. And by an effectual conception is here meant that which is not only allowed by the understanding and then dismissed and laid aside, but that which vitally pervades the whole mind and heart, which imbues the affections, which is ever at hand to mould even the first forms of thought as it is born, and to impress its character upon it more and more, as it assumes a more definite shape, and finds vent outwardly in word or act.'—pp. 145, 146.

Mr. Gladstone is mighty cautious in the application of his own principles; he still with great prudence clings to his darling generalities, full of unmeaning sophistry. And no wonder; for if he attempted to put his theory into plain language, it would at once be seen that his 'one visible church' is an utter nonentity, and that those parts or portions of the visible church, as he is pleased plausibly to call them, are much more distinct

churches than the separate churches of our own religious denominations. These last have at least similarity of laws and unity of spirit ; the parts or portions of Mr. Gladstone's 'one visible church' have neither the one nor the other. If there be 'one visible church,' it must have, according to Mr. Gladstone's own reasonings, unity of government, possible inter-communion of its members, one code of laws, universality of jurisdiction. We need not ask if there be anything at all like this ; whether the *two principal* parts of this one visible church have not excommunicated one another ; whether the Church of England does not act with as complete independence as the church of Rome, and the church of Rome as the Greek church,—the three truly kindred bodies to which Mr. Gladstone is pleased to restrict all claim to being called a church of Christ,—or whether all are not far more truly divided than any of the churches of the Congregationalists. That they embrace a larger number of individuals has nothing at all to do with the matter.

Here we may make another obvious remark. If these, not merely independent, but actually hostile communities can be said to constitute 'one visible church,' or parts or portions of it, there is certainly no reason whatever why the separate communities of all other denominations of Christians may not be considered as being substantially one, and possessing visible unity. The simple fact is, however, that Mr. Gladstone's 'one visible church' is a pure fiction of his own fancy ; and it is most amusing to find him admitting, in the preceding paragraph, that 'it *may be* that she has lost that virgin beauty and 'harmony of her form which adorned her youth, and that, so 'far, the affections she once riveted upon herself are now baffled 'and without a home.' A fine admission for one who maintains that, according to the whole theory of Scripture, God *designed* that His church should be 'visibly *one*.' If this 'one visible church,' therefore, cannot be pointed out, the declared purpose of God, by fair inference from Mr. Gladstone's reasonings, has been frustrated ! If it *can* be pointed out, we ask which is it ? not 'parts or portions' of it, so unlike and so hostile as the churches of Rome and England, for in this way, as already observed, we *may prove* *any* communities of Christians to be parts of 'one visible church' ; but 'one visible church' which fulfils Mr. Gladstone's own conditions of such an institution ; having vital connexion and fellowship through all its parts, one government and one jurisdiction. He never can consistently realize his views till he becomes a Romanist, and in spirit and principle he is more than half one already.

We have already quoted one specimen of the cautious vagueness with which Mr. Gladstone is pleased to express his mystical

views on this subject, and the circumspection with which he refrains from fairly stating which *is* his 'one visible church.' We find the same curious mixture of confident presumption that there *is* one visible church, with the same total uncertainty as to which or where it is, even in the chapter in which he comes to apply his principles to the Church of England, where of course his object is to show that, whatever be the upshot, the Church of England is a particularly bright exhibition of primitive Christianity, and an undoubted *branch* of the 'one true apostolic church.' But we again ask, what has this one visible church to do with such *perfectly independent branches*? and if it be connected with others, where and what are they? in other words, which is *the* 'one visible church'? Mr. Gladstone of course takes upon him to inform us 'that the Church 'established by law in this land has a right to be considered 'within its borders, as having the stewardship of the covenant, 'and the care in a religious sense of the souls of the people, 'whether they will hear or whether they will forbear.' Without stopping to expose the rampant and most gratuitous claims to the *jus divinum* involved in all such expressions, we beg to ask what is meant by any particular *branch* of the 'one visible church,' so secluding itself within its own borders as in effect to cut itself off from all other branches of it? If there are other branches subordinated, like itself, to some common government, and acknowledging one common jurisdiction with it, what are they? We repeat, it inevitably follows from Mr. Gladstone's own reasonings, either that the Church of England is itself the sole representative of the 'one visible church,' a doctrine no doubt very pleasant to the modern Oxford school, or that there is no such thing in existence. The perplexities which beset Mr. Gladstone in his laborious search after his 'one visible church,' are well indicated in the following passage. The closing sentence would seem in fact formally to surrender the point, if it were not expressed with as much disregard to grammar as our author generally manifests to logic; so that it is really difficult to ascertain what is his meaning, or indeed whether he can be said to have had any.

'The modern temper, it will be found, leads us to act directly in the teeth of apostolic diction and practice. Those holy men ever speak of *the* faith, of *the* church: we, on the other hand, as if there were faiths many, and churches many. I am not yet inquiring which is the true faith and the true church; nor yet hastening to decide that in no more than one body can the grand results of the Christian covenant be found to have been in certain degrees accomplished; but in remarking simply that the notion of a number of bodies not observing the laws of church communion, and a number of forms of religious

profession differing in material particulars, without any preferable claim on the part of one or another, belong, if to any gospel at all, not to that gospel which was preached by the blessed twelve. And this I trust is clear: negatively, because the apostles nowhere intimate the lawfulness of such a state of things; positively, because they inculcate in distinct terms the doctrines of 'one faith,' 'one body, and one spirit.' Which faith is right it may be difficult to find—difficult to know that we are right; at present it is rather to be feared that, letting slip the idea of the unity of the faith, forgetting that, whichever it be, it is in its essence one, and slumbering in easy indifference respecting all unity, we ought to know, that we are therefore necessarily wrong; which is the first, and a laborious and painful step, towards becoming right.'—pp. 284, 285.

Mr. Gladstone of course invests the 'Church' with all those high prerogatives which suit his high Church principles; she is something between the Saviour and the soul, and she is charged with the office of the interpretation of the Scripture. Our author, with that peculiarly happy knack which he possesses, of just taking for granted what ought to be proved, and of proving with great pomp and formality what nobody denies, simply contents himself with affirming that 'God has established 'in the church an office of interpretation. Not that there has 'been infallibility or impeccability in its discharge. But there 'can be no doubt of its existence, nor any question that it 'attaches peculiarly to the *accredited* ministry of the Church.' How many knotty questions may in a few lines be happily disposed of in this pleasant way of simple affirmation! One is quite at a loss to imagine how our author could have thought it necessary to write so bulky a volume, with such a very convenient and concise method of logic in his possession. Half a dozen pages would amply suffice for the satisfactory decision of half the questions which have tormented theology. At the close of this chapter Mr. Gladstone takes an opportunity of canvassing some, though by no means all, nor the most important, of the objections which he not unnaturally surmises may be taken to his lofty views of 'church authority,' and amongst the rest that derived from their incompatibility with the liberty of private judgment. His ingenious method of extricating the unhappy man who finds the conclusions of individual conscience in opposition to the authority of the Church, is so well worthy both of his logic and his principles, that we shall crave leave to cite the passage.

' And lastly, persons are in great alarm for their liberty of private judgment. The true doctrine of private judgment is, as has been shown by many writers, most important and most sacred: it has the direct sanction of Scripture. It teaches the duty, and as correlative

to the duty, the right of a man to assent freely and rationally to the truth. It is commonly called a right to inquire ; but it is to inquire for the purpose of assenting : for he has no right (that is, none as before God) to reject the truth after his inquiry. It is a right to assent to truth, to inquire into alleged truth. Now all that the true idea of the church proposes to him is a probable and authorized guide. This is wholly distinct from the Romish infallibility. The Church of England holds individual freedom in things spiritual to be an essential attribute of man's true nature, and an essential condition of the right reception of the gospel ; and testifies to that sentiment in the most emphatic mode, by encouraging the fullest communication of Scripture to the people. Yet is it perfectly possible that the best use of such a freedom may often be thus exemplified : when a man, having prayed for light from God, and having striven to live in the spirit of his prayer, and yet finding his own opinion upon a point of doctrine opposite to that of the universal undivided church, recognizes the answer to his prayer and the guide to his mind in the declarations of the creeds rather than in his own single and perhaps recent impressions upon the subject, not thus surrendering his own liberty of judgment, but using it in order to weigh and compare the probabilities of his or the church's correctness respectively, and acting faithfully on the result.'—pp. 155, 156.

It is no doubt very kind of Mr. Gladstone to have provided this convenient contrivance for those who find themselves in the awkward predicament hinted at above ; who, in a word, find their *conscientious* individual convictions at variance with those of the 'undivided' church. The question, it seems, which such a man is to consider and decide, in order to determine his belief in the points on which he doubts, is not whether such and such doctrines are false and unscriptural or not ; but whether he thinks the whole of the 'undivided' church is likely to be right rather than he ! And if he thinks so, he may say that he believes such and such things to be true, though in fact he believes them false, because he believes that the church is more likely to be right than he ! Upon this principle, no doubt, a man in the early church, who thought he ought not to eat of meat offered to idols, might have safely done so, and given up his scruples, because he might certainly think it more probable that an inspired apostle, who declares it indifferent, was more likely to be in the right than he ; yet Paul cruelly declares that such a scrupulous person is 'condemned if he eat,' because he does it with an uneasy conscience ! Again ; who does not see that the assent of such a man is not to the doctrines to which his assent is demanded, but to quite a different matter, namely, that he thinks it more probable that others are in the right than he ? We will not stop to inquire what is that 'undivided' church which the scrupulous man is to take as the guide in preference

to his own convictions. A Christian may well say, 'I do not know where it is; all Christians, indeed, who receive the *whole canon* of Scripture, admit that there are certain doctrines essential to Christianity, but then I do not find that I deny any of these—and for those disputed matters which Mr. Gladstone is peculiarly anxious to recommend, I do not find any 'undivided' church to which I can refer my scruples.' Oh! yes, says Mr. Gladstone, there are those who profess to receive the Scriptures, who deny many of the *essential* doctrines of Christianity, thereby showing that the favorite plea of the sufficiency of the Scriptures is a fallacious one;—as the Socinians, for example. Mr. Gladstone is very fond of urging this argument; and yet he *must* know that this is a false statement. The Socinians do *not* receive the *whole canon* of Scripture; they are compelled to reject some portions and to garble others to give even a semblance of plausibility to their system. We repeat, that amongst those who receive the *whole canon* of Scripture, we know of none who deny any of those doctrines which constitute the essence of Christianity, and as to those disputed points which are *not* essential, we know of no 'undivided' church to which the scrupulous conscience could submit, even if any such implicit deference were justifiable. So much for the uncertainty of this absurd rule.—But it is the *rule itself* to which we chiefly object. It is an outrage on all the sacred claims of conscience; nor do we believe that a more lax and dangerous maxim has often issued even from the school of Ignatius Loyola. In reading this passage, we have been strongly reminded of one of the many inimitable passages in the Provincial Letters, in which Pascal sarcastically exposes the iniquities of that most flagitious and pernicious fraternity. "'Verily,' said I, 'this must be a dream! Do I really hear religious people talk in this manner? Tell me, father, are you absolutely and conscientiously of this opinion?' 'No, certainly.' 'Why then speak against your conscience?' 'Not at all: I did not speak according to *my* conscience, but in conformity to Pontius and Father Bauny, and you may follow them with safety, for they are skilful polemics.'

Our author's fourth chapter is on the Sacraments, in which, with the same cautious abstinence from all close logic, and the same superabundance of affected philosophy and real mysticism, Mr. Gladstone defends the usual high Church views upon this subject; 'the grand delusion of baptismal regeneration, and the semi-popish view of the Eucharist,' the solemn words employed in the institution of which 'are not adequately, that is, scripturally, represented by any explanation which resolves them into figure, and that there is a real though not a carnal truth in the words 'This is my body.'

Of these views Mr. Gladstone is pleased to write as follows.

‘Such is the substantial ground-work of religion,’ laid ‘by the inspired writers in the doctrine of the Sacraments. ‘Thus viewed, it does not dwell in fancy, in speculation, or ‘even in argument’ [this last assertion we devoutly believe]; ‘but is exhibited,’ he proceeds, in a choice mystical vein, ‘as ‘dependent upon an actual food, received like the manna from ‘God, and supplying, after the type of manna, nutriment in ‘forms and elements too subtle, too inward, for human sense ‘or intellect to reach. Can we fail to recognize the beauty of ‘such a doctrine, and its adequacy to our need? In the body ‘as well as in the mind, we are fallen creatures: in the body as ‘well as under mental conditions of a human kind, came our ‘Lord and Saviour; and now, accordingly, He applies His ‘medicine, even the participation of Himself, to the whole of ‘that nature, which in all its parts alike requires and responds ‘to His effectually renovating power; ‘My soul hath a desire ‘‘and a longing to enter into the courts of the Lord; my heart ‘‘and my *flesh* rejoice in the living God.’

With respect to the ‘baptismal regeneration’ of infants our author says, ‘I have read with sorrow, in the popular work of ‘an excellent man,* some taunt to this effect: how can the ‘heart of a child be changed by throwing a little water on his ‘face? The pious writer, when he penned that sentence, did ‘not reflect upon it, or he would have perceived that it con- ‘tained the seed of all infidelity. For if a man is to judge ‘according to his own imaginations of the competency of divine ‘means, and to deny and renounce effects by anticipation, ‘wherever he conceives that the assigned causes are inadequate ‘to their office, not a shred of Christianity, nor indeed of phy- ‘sical truth, will remain to us.’ Mr. Gladstone ought to know, and cannot but know, that we deny baptismal regeneration not according to our own ‘imagination of the competency of divine ‘means, nor because we are disposed to deny and renounce ‘effects by anticipation wherever we conceive that the assigned ‘causes are inadequate to their office,’ but simply because we cannot perceive that there are any perceptible effects *at all*, and that we know not what sort of causes they are which produce no effects. We look at the myriads who are said thus to be baptismally regenerated, and we do not perceive the slightest effect on them; we compare them with those who have not been subjected to this mysterious influence, and we can see no difference in the two cases whatever; if we could see that infants were regenerated in the scriptural, or indeed in any

* Village Dialogues, by the Rev. Rowland Hill.

intelligible sense of the term whatsoever, it is not the mystery of the thing that would at all shock our belief. We merely refuse to give the high-sounding name of regeneration to nothing, or to represent mighty causes in constant and irresistible operation—only in order to produce a nonentity. We cannot understand the doctrine that there are causes which produce no effects.

The following is an affecting specimen of Mr. Gladstone's high Church divinity, and directly tends to encourage that blind and delusive attachment to mere rites, that *opus operatum* of the sacraments, which is so fearfully prevalent among the members of the Establishment.

'The sacraments are the peculiar and distinctive instruments, whereby men receive those essential elements which constitute their unity in Christ. They are appointed to be the universal medium of communion with Him. They are distinguished in some such especial respects from every other means of grace, that they are properly regarded as occupying a distinct place: not, be it observed, as first instruments of conversion, but as instruments of sanctification to the converted in the cases of adults, while only in the case of infants, who need no conversion from acquired guilt, is a sacrament appointed as the specific means of initiating holiness. If we compare them with other appointed means, their distinctive character, which they claim to bear as means of communion with Christ, and with one another in Christ, will be made more evident.

'If we compare them, firstly, with public worship, we see at once that attendance on public worship does not pointedly demand or exact from the individual any such direct and substantive participation as is required by the holy communion. If we compare them with the preaching of the word, the blessing which belongs thereto is, as a general rule, both inferior and more indeterminate: for the word so preached is mingled with human imperfections; whereas, that which is received in the sacrament is wholly divine; and the reasonable assumption that the blessing is realized, is more nearly positive in the act of communicating than in hearing, which is almost entirely passive. If we look to the private acts of prayer and reading of the word, these have no witness but ourselves, and belong to us individually alone, and therefore in a subordinate capacity: for it is in our collective capacity as members of the Church that we are members and, by consequence, organs of Christ; and the purely individual functions of religion, essential as they are, are yet important chiefly as means to effectuate and establish us in our highest capacity as living portions of His body. Observe, lastly, that a heathen may attend Christian worship, may hear the word, may read, may pray—and yet may remain a heathen: but he cannot, as a heathen, have part in the sacraments.'

—pp. 170—172.

But we must not pause any longer upon the absurdities and melancholy delusions of this chapter.

In chapter the fifth, Mr. Gladstone enters upon his favorite theme of the apostolical succession. If the other high Church principles he has undertaken to defend on the grounds of *a priori* probability and of natural adaptation to the purposes of the gospel, have given him some trouble, it may naturally be expected that he has had more than ordinary difficulty in dealing with this intractable piece of high Church folly. By dint, however, of sedulous and consistent use of all those artifices of controversy which he has so copiously employed in the previous parts of the work, he has given the matter perhaps as plausible an aspect as it is susceptible of, and has thrown as much of an air of intelligence into the facé of that stupid and wooden idol as could fairly be expected. In the first place, as usual, he indulges in a great deal of pompous commonplace to which every one is sure to assent, and which may safely be admitted upon any theory whatsoever. See particularly pages 254—256. In the next place, in tracing the 'beautiful adaptations,' as he calls them, 'of this doctrine to our state and necessities, and to the 'ends of the gospel,' he has taken care to keep out of sight, as usual, the gigantic and most pernicious evils to which it has always given rise, and to which, as we maintain, it must inevitably give rise. He has done just the same in treating of the doctrine of the sacraments. While enlarging on the fancied inestimable value of baptismal regeneration, he has quite forgotten to touch upon the terrible delusions which it is so calculated to promote and perpetuate; the blind and stupid notion that the sacraments are as such mysteriously efficacious, apart from the exercise of the understanding and the moral condition of the affections and the heart. In like manner when treating of the apostolical succession, he has quite forgotten to point out the terrible facilities which it opens to priestcraft, the superstitious ideas which it has ever tended to cherish on the subject of official sanctity, no matter what the moral character and ministerial qualifications of the priest. Where this is made the *sine quâ non* of a valid ministry, it is sure to assume a prime importance, and becomes in fact the distinctive mark of a true minister of Christ, to the neglect and disparagement of those moral qualifications and real aptitudes for the office which are the subjects on which Scripture chiefly insists. Indeed it cannot be otherwise; for he who *does* possess episcopal ordination, according to the theory of Mr. Gladstone's school, is assuredly a true minister of Jesus Christ even though he be no true Christian, and can regenerate by baptism and absolve from sins, even though himself the disgrace of his order.

In the next place, Mr. Gladstone takes care, of course, always to assume the very points which have been in such constant litigation, and to speak with the most edifying confidence

and presumption of the certainty of propositions which have scarcely a particle of probability to sustain them. As to any direct historical evidence on behalf of this preposterous doctrine, evidence which alone could satisfy any reasonable inquirer, and without which all his *à priori* plausibilities go for nothing, the very plan of his work enables him to decline it, or at best to treat it with a truly wise and discreet superficiality. 'I do not 'profess to treat of these things fully;' this is the sort of answer which is ever ready when any real perplexity presents itself, and our author is thus sure to secure the advantage of keeping out of sight all the weaker parts of his argument. Now it is full, clear, scriptural warrant for the arrogant and outrageous assumptions involved in the doctrine of the apostolical succession for which we ask, and without which it is impossible we could ever be satisfied. So far from our expecting compliance with this reasonable demand, the more we examine the subject the more we are persuaded that the whole theory rests not upon one, but upon a number of gratuitous assumptions, each utterly destitute of intrinsic probability and of historic evidence. Where is the proof that it was ever intended that there should be successors to the office of the apostles, exercising the same supreme authority, without the inspiration and miraculous powers which alone could qualify men for its exercise? Where is the proof that if any were designed to take that office, it is bishops in the modern sense of that word, seeing that bishops and presbyters are used interchangeably throughout Scripture to designate the same office, and that a very different and inferior one? Where is the proof that ordination at the hands of such men is anything more than a simple designation to an office, an impressive rite of recognition, and nothing more? Where is the proof that it transmits that mysterious and awful 'gift' expressed in the ordination service? Where is the proof that it has been transmitted entire and intact, in periods of universal heresy and ignorance, through the hands of heretical, infidel, grossly ignorant, debauched, and profligate prelates? Do not the best of the early fathers acknowledge that the 'succession' to which alone *they* attach any value, is one which involves uncorruptedness of faith and purity of life, as well as lineal descent, and that if the former be wanting, the latter must go for nothing, and the orders thus conveyed become invalidated? Where is the proof, that even supposing scarcely any moral causes *can* invalidate the succession (for it would not be convenient to its advocates to admit that many such causes could do so, with the corruptions of the middle ages full in their view), where is the proof that there has been no accidental flaw in the long lineage? Who will undertake to make out a complete catalogue up to any one of the apostles,

or satisfactorily settle any one of the endless disputes upon that subject? and, lastly, what is conveyed after all, what transmitted, when it is acknowledged that this mysterious 'gift' conveyed in ordination from hand to hand, involves no miraculous powers, no accession of intellect, no increase of purity, but leaves the bishop or the priest who was wicked or stupid before ordination, as wicked and stupid after it? Yes,—there is one thing gained; a notion is encouraged that the external marks of being a minister of Christ are the primary things, to which the moral qualifications for the office are subordinate; for if the bishop be properly consecrated, and the priest be episcopally ordained,—in other words, if he be in the line of the succession, he bears the character of a true minister of Christ, and can truly perform the functions of the office; and no destitution of intellectual or moral aptitudes can divest him of the one, or unfit him for the other.

We repeat, then, that the whole doctrine of the apostolical succession rests not upon one, but upon a number of gratuitous assumptions, utterly destitute either of historical evidence or of intrinsic probability; and yet Mr. Gladstone, good easy man! believes it all, nay thinks it so very clear, that he affirms that both to the minister and to his charge, it must be a consoling and sustaining evidence of authority co-ordinate in value and importance with that which arises from the possession of 'all the requisites of Christian character and virtue,' from unimpeachable rectitude and transparent consistency, as well as from the self-recommended sublimity and efficacy of the truths thus inculcated and enforced by all the persuasive influence of an upright and a holy example. We can hardly help laughing while we make the statement. Mr. Gladstone seems to think, for example, that the doctrine of the apostolical succession is so *very* clear, that if such men as Howe, or Baxter, or Robert Hall, had happened to possess that unspeakable privilege of episcopal ordination, it would have really added to the weight of the truths they uttered, and the efficacy of the consolations they offered as they sat by the bedside of the sick and the dying: that they would have spoken with greater weight, could the object of their solicitude but have known that they had received their commission through a long line of ignorant, heretical, or impure ecclesiastics. We fear that if the legitimate claims of these great men (we mean legitimate according to the gospel, which gives as the sole criterion of who are true ministers and who are not,—'By their fruits shall ye know them,' not according to Mr. Gladstone's criterion of historical derivation) could not enforce the truths they uttered, their case would be beyond the help of the doctrine of 'apostolical succession.'

But we must remind Mr. Gladstone that his statement involves something more, from the assertion of which, if he be a

consistent man, he will not flinch. If the doctrine of the apostolical succession be supposed to be true, it will not only *add* weight to him who has all the moral requisites of a Christian minister, but *give* weight to him who has not; in other words, it leads us to the pleasant conclusion that he who is no true Christian, may nevertheless be a true minister of Christ; a doctrine which the successionists do not scruple generally to avow. If historical derivation of the office through the legitimate channels be made *the* criterion, it cannot be otherwise; he who has been episcopally ordained has authority to teach and to preach, whatever else he may be; he who has not, has no authority to do the one or the other. It must, no doubt, be an unspeakable consolation to the dying man to know that his ghostly adviser, who sits by his bedside, though profligate, or frivolous, or infidel at heart, and giving the lie in his whole life and conduct to all the solemn truths he is uttering, has yet received his commission through all the impurities of the middle ages! Query; what ought to be the strength of historical testimony to a doctrine which will make the teaching of such a man authoritative and efficacious? in other words, what amount of historical testimony would suffice to convince us of a truth which our senses contradict, as, for example, that arsenic is wholesome, and that darkness is light? The obvious answer is, None. If the doctrine of the apostolical succession, therefore, were as clear as it is dubious, it could not reconcile us to any of those enormities in which it involves us: but to suppose it capable, endlessly disputed as it has been even amongst the learned, of affording consolation to the unlearned, except by misleading them into a grossly superstitious and dangerous view of official sanctity, is the very height of absurdity. Our Lord's rule is plain and simple, like every other rule he gave us, 'By their fruits ye shall know them;' the apostolical succession, on the other hand, seems to say, by their fruits ye shall *not* know them; but by this—have they been episcopally ordained or not? Mr. Gladstone's statement is so very amusing that we shall here cite it.

'Now let us suppose such a mind tempted, for example, with rationalizing doubts, questioning whether there really be anything of spiritual grace in the gospel, and seeking advice and counsel from a minister of God, it may be upon the bed of agony or in the very grasp of death. Grant that the consulted party may have the requisites of Christian character and virtue, as well as competent abilities; grant that he may appear to speak so as we, in our human frailty, should judge suitable to the dispensations of our heavenly Father—still, when the moral being is rocked from its foundations, and a part of the incumbent trial is to satisfy the disquieted and turbulent questioner within that the matter spoken is such as befits the high origin it

claims, then, I ask, is it nothing that the tempest-tossed understanding is not left merely to abstract speculation founded upon its own antecedent perceptions of the rules and laws of truth, but that he who has come to supply its need is able to say, in addition to the ostensible goodness and comfort of his assurances, ‘that which I say is said under an awful responsibility: I who speak, have been commissioned to carry a message from God to man, the message of the gospel of Christ. His commission came to me by no mere fancy or conclusion of my own, but from the hands of those to whom He in the flesh, seen by their eyes, heard by their ears, handled by their hands, intrusted it, to be delivered down in perpetual descent: so not the wit or will of man, but He, the Holy One, has given me the power and the charge to minister to your soul, at the most awful peril of my own.’ I ask, are there no more elements of probability in such an historical commission than in a supposed inward message, of which there is no example in Scripture, and to which it is not in the nature of things that any test adequate to prove its genuineness should be applied?’

—pp. 271, 272.

On this we remark, first, that Mr. Gladstone has as usual ingeniously evaded the case of the minister who has the supposed criterion of the apostolical succession, but who has *not* the moral requisites, and, secondly, he must very well know that the criterion of those he opposes is not that of a ‘supposed ‘inward message;’ but is furnished by the simple application of the already oft-quoted words of our Lord, ‘By their fruits ye ‘shall know them; do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of ‘thistles?’

Mr. Gladstone, like many other writers on the same subject, finds a difficulty in replying to the objection, that the title of the bishops as successors to the apostles, and of the doctrine of episcopacy generally, as understood by writers of his stamp, are so little sanctioned (*we* should say, are so utterly *unsanctioned*), by scriptural authority. His mode of getting over it is not a little amusing.

‘Nothing, I may add, can be more contrary to reason than to complain because Scripture does not convey to us a full account of the establishment of the order of bishops. And this not simply because the notices which it does furnish are entirely analogous to the general character of the New Testament in its historical bearings, which is not systematic, but occasional; but further and more especially, because to expect from Scripture a full account of the establishment of an order, *whose function it was to replace the apostles*, is to anticipate what is absolutely precluded by the nature of the case, inasmuch as Scripture only records what took place during the lifetime of the apostles, mentioning the death of one alone, and in no other case carrying down the account of their proceedings to the conclusion of their ministry or life.’—p. 240.

And so it appears that it is unreasonable to expect the apostles plainly to tell us that they *intended* the bishops should be their successors, inasmuch as during their lifetime they themselves were discharging the functions of bishops ! Now though it would undoubtedly be very unreasonable to expect that dead men should speak, yet it is not altogether unprecedented, we believe, for persons to give utterance to their intentions before they die. The above reasoning of Mr. Gladstone is about as good as would be that of a man who should lay claim to a certain estate, and upon being told by the lawyers that there was no will, document, or scrap of paper left behind by the owner which devised it to him, should reply, ' How can 'you be so unreasonable ? while he was alive, it was his own, ' but it could not be expected that he should put me in pos- 'session before his death ! ' Whether this reasoning would be likely to be satisfactory in a court of justice we leave our readers to say. If so, it would be a very cheap and easy way of becoming rich men, and of obtaining good estates.

Not less amusing is Mr. Gladstone's reply to the argument that we cannot be *certain* of the apostolical transmission of ministerial power, inasmuch as we cannot be certain that there has not been a flaw somewhere in the long chain. Some ordinations of bishops may have been for some cause or other invalid, and though such ordinations may have been very rare, yet as no one knows *which* they are, it is impossible to say in what lines the succession may have been incorruptibly transmitted, and in what vitiated. It must fill the soul of a presbyter with horror to think that he may possibly have been ordained by a bishop who had not been himself properly consecrated, or who had been consecrated by those who had no right to consecrate him. Unless this argument can be fairly refuted, no individual presbyter is absolutely certain that he has the mysterious gifts conferred by ordination ; that he has the inestimable benefits of apostolical succession. The superficial thinker, indeed, might be ready to suppose that possessions could not be so very inestimable of which a man is not certain whether he has them or not ; which if he has them not, he never misses so long as he supposes he has them, and which if they could be taken from him, he would be absolutely ignorant when, how, or by whom, they were filched away. Not so, however, with Mr. Gladstone and his party ; and our author has accordingly brushed up his arithmetic to meet the difficulty. By working several interesting sums in the rule of three, he endeavors to show that even on the least favorable computation, the chances against the validity of the ordination of any one bishop are as eight thousand to one. And truly, if the general notions of the successionists be admitted, that there is scarcely *anything* that can

invalidate orders, except some trumpery irregularities in the rite of ordination itself (and those who attach weight to such doctrines are always more solicitous about what is circumstantial than what is essential); if it be true, we say, that a man may be a very sufficient bishop but a very bad man, we think it very likely that Mr. Gladstone's computations may not be very far from the truth. But if we are to adopt the doctrine of common sense, that true Christian character is essential to the validity of ministerial claims, that purity of doctrine and purity of life may be justly demanded, there are not a few ages of the church in which the difficulty would be to find an ordination that *was* valid, and when, so far from the probabilities in favor of the validity of any one ordination being eight thousand to one, they would rather be as one to eight thousand.

Mr. Gladstone's seventh chapter is devoted to the discussion of the 'Practical Relations' of 'Church Principles.' He here considers the various objections which may not unreasonably be brought against them. The first he touches is their alleged tendency to Romanism. But though there are some particularly amusing things in this section, we must not pause to notice them, as the space which this article has already occupied admonishes us that we must speedily draw to a conclusion. We cannot so easily persuade ourselves to pass over the second section, in which he vainly endeavors to combat the objection grounded on the tendency of these principles to 'unchurch' all communities of Christians not possessing episcopal ordination. That they not only have this tendency, but necessarily deprive the ministers of such communities of all authority, and the sacraments they administer of all efficacy, is indisputable, and it is not a little edifying to see the sophistical nonsense by which our author endeavors to defend his principles against such outrages on all charity. He argues the case on a variety of grounds, most of which we have no room to notice; amongst others, that if there be any uncharitableness in church principles as professed by episcopalians, it is equally shared by those who make similar claims to the 'succession,' only in the line of the 'presbyterate.' To this we have merely to reply, 'Honi soit 'qui mal y pense';' 'let the galled jade wince.' It is no argument to us, who do not allow the arrogant claims of 'succession,' whether made by Episcopalian or Presbyterians. In the meantime it *does* discredit the claims of 'succession' to perceive that such very different parties are at endless strife as to which has the rightful title to make them.

Another argument of like force is, that these church principles admit far more than they exclude. According to them, the church of Rome immediately becomes a great body of

Christians, a glorious portion of the 'visible church ;' while they exclude *only* Presbyterians, the Lutheran churches, Independents, Baptists, Wesleyan Methodists, and a few other bodies. Now, argues our author, these latter bodies, who deny the said 'church principles,' would deny the title of the Romish church to be considered a part of the true church of Christ. We are sorry to spoil the triumph of Mr. Gladstone's argument, or to hint that he has argued here with his usual unfairness or his usual obtuseness. He must know very well that it is not the denial of what *he* calls church principles which would make the Independent or the Baptist withhold the title of church of Christ from the church of Rome. She might hold the doctrine of apostolical succession and welcome, like the Church of England, or like the Episcopal church of America, without any danger of being denied to be a church, if this were the only thing objected to. It is purely on account of other *more enormous and vital corruptions*, that we deny her the title, and as long as she holds those corruptions, we must deny it to her. The denial of 'church principles,' therefore, does not 'unchurch' a single community of Christians ; the only, but the all-important difference on this point between Mr. Gladstone and us is, that the assertion of these principles is not sufficient *per se* to *constitute* a church of Christ. This he must surely believe, for if the mere possession of these principles amidst all the gross superstitions and corruptions of Romanism be sufficient to justify its title of a true church of Christ we are really ignorant that anything could annul it, where these all-saving principles are but retained. But Mr. Gladstone will probably glory in this theory ; he certainly speaks in very different terms of Romanism (purely because she retains his 'church principles') from those which would have been employed by the reformers. Like many others of the Oxford school, he has well learnt the charitable lesson inculcated by its poetical forerunner :

‘ Speak gently of our sister’s fall !’

But to return to the argument. We have shown that the denial of Mr. Gladstone's church principles 'unchurches' *none* ; their assertion unchurches many. Other arguments, therefore, must be sought besides those of recrimination ; and Mr. Gladstone has plenty, though the quality of them is by no means proportioned to the quantity. And to make short work of the matter, he boldly denies that his church principles imply any outrage upon the privileges of a single Christian ! The following passages contain his curious explication of this point.

‘ But now, with respect to those who confessedly have no right apostolical succession (whether the episcopal succession only, or the presbyterial also be entitled to that appellation), I repeat my fourth proposition, namely, that church principles do not logically deprive them of anything substantial which they themselves claim to possess ; that they go to exclude no true lover of Christ from the true church of Christ ; and therefore *à fortiori*, no such person who, according to the criteria established by his own professed opinions, belongs to it ; that they do not represent persons of piety in any communion as debarred from membership in the church, in any sense in which they themselves lay claim to it. I have varied the verbal forms of the proposition only with a view to explain and to impress the meaning.

‘ The question whether the name of ‘ church ’ be predicate of this or that religious society or communion, is one whose importance wholly depends upon the answer which is given to a preliminary inquiry ; namely, to this, what is signified by the term ‘ church.’ If we reply to that inquiry, the church is a body visible, permanent, authoritative, bound to unity of faith and of communion, and empowered to administer sacramental ordinances, in which spiritual graces and gifts inhere ; the disciple of Protestantism as it is represented in many of our dissenting bodies, will reply : ‘ I know of no such church : I disclaim the idea, and deny the existence, of any such church, in which the invisible is tied down to the visible. I believe in an invisible church, whose members on earth have no association of a palpable and external kind, but only that of unseen bodiless communion of love, and charity, and Christian graces, held in common, at least, if not positively interchanged. And I believe in many visible churches, making up, if you please to call it so, one visible church ; which are spontaneous associations formed by the will of man, without anything more than God’s general command to form them ; or any restriction to particular modes ; or any corporeal conditions, like succession in the ministry, on which their essence is dependent. They are in their nature external. The ordinances they administer have no grace abiding in them, though they become occasions of grace to those receivers whose minds they stir up to the energetic emotions and acts of faith, love, and prayer. A man may be a true church member without being in them : a man may be in them, and yet not a member, in any sense, of the spiritual church.’

—pp. 410—412.

‘ If such and such only were the nature of the visible church, and of visible churches, of Christ, I do not see that the name given or the name withheld, could be, upon its intrinsic merits, worth the labors, the pains of a contest, and the hazard of that bitterness which all differences upon matters of presumed concern are so apt to engender. The character of societies thus constituted, whether it be in itself a thing good or bad, or indifferent, is at least something quite apart from the Christian church as represented in the records of ecclesiastical antiquity, and in the documents and institutions of the Church of England, which ascribes visibility and authority to the church ; requires episcopal succession for the assumption of the ministry, and teaches that the sacraments have in themselves, and are actually made

up and composed of, two parts, one of which is an inward spiritual grace.'—p. 414.

Here is a curious discovery. 'Church principles' do no wrong to the Presbyterian, though they deny his church to be a church and his ministers to be true ministers of Christ; and that because he himself would not wish that *his* church should be called a church in the sense of the Church of England, or his ministers, ministers after the order episcopal. He would reply, 'why 'truly I do not complain that you represent my church as *not* like 'yours, for I should be very sorry if there were any close resem- 'blance; or my ministers as *not* like yours, for I hope they never will 'be; but it happens that these words 'church and ministers' are 'terms employed in the New Testament, and do designate *something* ' (whatever it be) *important to the* interests of every Christian; 'the grand dispute between us is as to which of us puts the 'right interpretation upon the words, or whether we need either 'of us include in our definitions of them anything which should 'absolutely exclude the rights of the church and ministry of 'the other. Now by boldly assuming that *yours* is the *right* 'and the *only right* interpretation, you deny *my* church the title 'to be called a church in the New Testament sense of that 'word, and my ministers to be called ministers in the like 'sense; all which I *affirm*; so that your principles do deprive 'me (though I quite agree with you that they do not do it 'logically') of something I claim to possess. I am quite 'ready to acknowledge that my church is *not* the Church of 'England, and in denying it to be so, you 'deprive me of 'nothing I claim to possess; but I do affirm, that it is, though 'not exclusively (God forbid!), a true church of Christ,—and 'you in denying it to be so, deprive me of something I claim to 'possess.' So much for this rotten argument.

But in his eagerness to defend his cherished principles from the charge of uncharitableness, Mr. Gladstone goes further, and concedes so much that, as he himself says, it may seem to many that 'under the explanations suggested the essence of 'church principles is allowed to escape.' Truly it would seem so to us if it were not that Mr. Gladstone himself appears to be in very great doubt how far or how much he shall concede; he is mighty coy and reluctant to come to the point; and appears continually struggling between the opposite claims of a little remaining charity and a great deal of remaining bigotry. 'It 'does not appear,' he afterwards says, when defending himself from the charge of having 'allowed the essence of church prin- 'ciples to escape,' 'it does not appear that we can either cate- 'gorically assert, or absolutely and without qualification deny' (Mr. Gladstone is almost as formal and wordy as Sir Robert

Hazlewood, of Hazlewood, himself) 'true church essence of a 'religious society not chargeable with heresy in doctrine, simply 'because it has not the apostolical succession.' A truly cautious conclusion. But he is not so sparing of his 'categorical 'assertions' on the other side. 'It *does* appear,' he says, 'that 'the assertion may be absolutely made where the apostolical 'succession is found.'

But we must not leave the last citation without reminding the reader that Mr. Gladstone, in the eagerness of his unusual fit of charity, once and again concedes principles which are absolutely fatal to his theory of the 'one visible church.' If this visible unity can be predicated of the various bodies he mentions—of the different parts of Christendom, for instance, during the great schism of the middle age—of the communities who have mutually excommunicated one another; of England and Rome, who have done the same; it might fairly be asserted that it may be predicated of the various communities who hold the fundamental principles of Christianity. It is now convenient to Mr. Gladstone to find that 'union in the church by 'no means requires as one of its essential conditions the 'con- 'sciousness' [we know not what to make of the word here, but Mr. Gladstone often seems to choose his words by lot,] 'and 'actual or *possible* communication of the persons *united*.' It must be a curious union—that of two rival parties who hated each other far worse than they hated sin; a curious *communion* that of the *mutually excommunicated*! But, in truth, the word 'church' is taken just as Mr. Gladstone wishes it—it is now of larger, now of more restricted signification; a mere nose of wax, which may be moulded just as he pleases.

But we cannot afford space to pursue the eccentric reasonings of our author any further. The remainder of his book is equally amusing with those parts on which we have commented. We cannot, however, withhold one or two short characteristic extracts more. Our author *protests* against his high Church principles being called *opinions*. No—they are far too sacred for *that*. What are they, then? it may be asked: matters of *demonstration*? Not exactly, says Mr. Gladstone, they are 'matters of *belief*.' 'Aye,' says the objector, 'matters of belief 'to those who believe them; to me, who do not believe them, 'they are matters of no belief at all, but of *opinion* only!' Let us hear our author himself.

'I think that justice would entitle, nay, perhaps that principle may require those, who are considered by some men peculiar, because they receive the doctrines of visibility and authority in the church, of grace in the sacraments, of succession in the ministry, of the anti-rationistic handling of Christian truths at large, to protest altogether and *in* *li-*

mine against applying to these religious principles the hazardous and seductive name of opinion. 'Opinion,' properly designates something partaking of what is merely human and arbitrary in its formation, something which seems to testify of itself that it is not clearly revealed, that its reception is a matter of indifference, that it has a subjective existence alone, and therefore has no claim to reception except where it is actually received. Every sound Christian (for example) would be shocked at saying, it is my opinion that Jesus Christ is the Redeemer of the world: would feel that there is a real though not always a palpable distinction between matters of opinion and of belief, as well as between matters of opinion and of demonstration: a distinction bearing in the first case mainly upon a moral, in the second principally upon an intellectual difference, in the relation between the thing perceived and the percipient mind. He would confess, that a real dishonour is done to matters of belief when they are treated as matters of opinion. Belief seems to be something of which the law and standard are external to ourselves: opinion, something depending on what is within us for its form and colour, and therefore essentially far more liable to be affected in its formation by the unchecked irregularities of the single mind.'--pp. 17. 18.

This is a fine specimen of Mr. Gladstone's usual art of obfuscation. His laboured account of opinion, that it properly designates 'a something partaking, &c.' and 'a something which seems to testify of itself that it is not clearly revealed, &c.' is most entertaining. The import of the whole of it seems to be simply this, that what we fully believe we do not usually call matter of opinion, inasmuch as that word would imply some uncertainty as to whether we are right, which by the very supposition is excluded; but unless we pretend to be infallible we must surely allow that it is matter of opinion to others who do *not* believe it. Now if the advocates of 'high church principles' merely contended that such principles were no matters of opinion *to them*, it would be all very reasonable. They believe them as devoutly as they believe the Bible, of which indeed they believe that the said principles constitute a part. But this is not enough for them. Mr. Gladstone protests against the application of the word 'opinions' to them at all, and by the example which he has so discreetly chosen would seem modestly to suggest the idea that these principles stand on the same footing with regard to certainty with the proposition that Jesus Christ is the Redeemer of the world. Mr. Gladstone may depend upon it, that however high church principles may be matters of devout belief with him and with those who think with him, they will never be to the rest of the world anything better than opinions, and very erroneous opinions too.

It is in the same spirit of assumption, which as we have already said, characterizes Mr. Gladstone all the way through, that our author tells us it 'seems an injustice that the Church of

‘England should ever be counted merely as one of a number of competing sects; and yet it must be admitted that, considering the mental habits of the day, there is an appearance, though an appearance alone, both of arrogance and of paradox, in the claim that another and a higher footing should be assigned her.’ Truly we are of the same opinion, and though our author endeavours to show the contrary by very long and laboured arguments, we cannot help thinking that he has left the matter just where he found it.

We have now done. We have spoken our opinion of Mr. Gladstone pretty plainly, as we were in duty bound to do. While we thank him for the calm and even tone which he has generally maintained, we are not the less disgusted with the very cool way in which he continually assumes the very points in dispute between him and those who oppose him; though not dictated, we believe, by a spirit of arrogance, it is scarcely less offensive. To his general talents and acquirements we would wish to do justice, though we must confess that a more illogical reasoner it has seldom, if ever, been our lot to deal with.

One more remark and we conclude. It is lamentable to find a layman, one belonging to a class generally considered the great bulwark against the encroachments of priestcraft, servilely following wherever the clergy lead, and acting as the champion of their most pernicious assumptions. Mr. Gladstone indeed seems to think that the fact of his being a laic will serve to recommend the principles he teaches; we heartily hope it will but excite wonder and contempt. He says,

‘In this labour there is less that bears a strictly professional character: it is conversant with theology indeed, but in the philosophical aspect of the science, upon the side and at the points where it comes into contact with man: and any results of the investigation may possibly be liable to less suspicion, when they have been wrought out by persons who came to their task under no official obligations or prepossessions, and who viewed their subject from a position occupied by them in common with every member of the church, who has in any degree given his mind to moral speculations.’—pp. 31, 32.

We will tell him, on the other hand, what a highly intelligent clergyman remarked, after the perusal of his book, to an acquaintance of ours. ‘That the clergy,’ said he, ‘with all their prepossessions and prejudices, partly of education, partly of self-interest, should favour doctrines, however monstrous, which so palpably make for their order, is nothing surprising. But that an intelligent layman should prostitute his talents and acquirements to their defence is most lamentable.’

Aut. II. Letters illustrative of the Reign of William III., from 1696 to 1708, addressed to the Duke of Shrewsbury, by James Vernon, Esq., Secretary of State. Now first published from the Originals. Edited by G. P. R. JAMES, Esq. 3 vols. 8vo. London: Henry Colburn.

ON the eighteenth of February, in the year 1688, the Marquis of Halifax, as speaker of the Lords, presented to the Prince of Orange, from the two houses of the English parliament, their memorable Declaration of Rights. That instrument set forth the arbitrary and illegal proceedings of the late king, and the consequent vote by which the parliament had declared the throne abdicated. Having further described the proceedings enumerated as contrary to law, it provided that the throne, which had thus become vacant, should be filled by the Prince and Princess of Orange, according to certain limitations aforesaid. More especially this document declared, that the pretended power to suspend the execution of laws by regal authority without consent of parliament, as it hath been assumed and exercised of late, is illegal:—that the commission for creating the late court of commissioners for ecclesiastical causes, and all other commissions and courts of the like nature, are illegal and pernicious:—that it is the right of the subject to petition the king, and that all commitments or prosecutions for such petitioning, are illegal:—that the raising or keeping within the kingdom a standing army in time of peace, unless by consent of parliament, is illegal:—that the subjects of the crown who are Protestants, may have arms for their defence, suitable to their condition, and as allowed by law:—that election of members of parliament ought to be free:—that freedom of speech and proceedings in parliament, ought not to be impeached or questioned in any place or court out of parliament:—that excessive bail ought not to be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted:—that juries ought to be duly impanelled and returned, and that jurors in all cases of high treason ought to be freeholders:—that all grants and promises of fines and forfeitures of particular persons, before conviction, are illegal and void:—and that for the redress of all grievances, and for the amending, strengthening, and preserving the laws, parliaments ought to be convened frequently.

In other words, the forms of security and liberty, for which the patriotic men of England have been contending, from the day when the throne of these realms was ascended by the first of the Stuart princes, to that in which it was abdicated by the last of them, was this day required to be recognized as good—not as so much of novelty introduced, but as so much ancient statute

reclaimed, so much constitutional right restored ! The Bill of Rights, passed a few months later, was a noble response to these noble demands. The point aimed at with so much steadiness and vigor in the Petition of Right, in the early days of Charles I., was to be secured by the Bill of Rights, on the accession of William III.

When we reach this issue of the struggle between law and prerogative, liberty and oppression, and call to mind how much some men had generously endured, and how much others had as bravely dared, with a view to such a consummation, we are disposed to look toward the statesmen of 1688 with feelings of admiration and envy. It was their happy distinction to survive where many had fallen. To them it was permitted to see that victory at their feet, which some of the noblest spirits in their departing moments could only descry obscurely in the distance. The hope so long deferred to others, gave place to fruition with them. Surely, we are ready to say, *their* worship at the shrine of liberty must have been pure and impassioned, contending as in the sight of such examples, and realizing such rare felicity and honor in its cause ! But, for the most part, it was not so. Speaking generally of the statesmen of 1688, it may be said, that they gathered where they had not strawed, and reaped where better—far better men had sown. We have all the feeling of a humiliating and painful transition, when we pass from the contemplation of the many great principles which acquired a new stability in our constitutional history from the revolution of 1688, to observe the character of the men by whose agency Providence wrought this great work in our behalf. We wonder, in the main, what such men had to do with such principles at all, and much more that these should have been the parties to give to them a new ascendancy and power in our history. No doubt we owe these persons a measure of praise, but the more potent causes of the course of events will be found in the extreme folly of the enemies of liberty, and in that real, though often latent sympathy with it, which had long since pervaded, if not the majority, certainly the more intelligent and influential portion of the English people. The popular feeling on this subject had betrayed only too many signs of feebleness, being driven to and fro much too easily by the changing winds that fell upon it. But during the reign of James II., this feeling took the better course, and the men of the revolution moved on upon this wave, and were strong in its strength. The issue, however, toward which it pointed, was hardly realized when the old tendency to reaction became visible.

The Jacobite faction may be said to have commenced with the return of James after his first flight from the capital. The

fallen greatness of kings must always be a dangerous spectacle to pass before the eyes of any people. In this case it disturbed the better exercise of reason, disposed men to look with less sternness to their principles, and afforded the slaves of the doctrine of legitimacy an opportunity to awaken and augment a feeling of disaffection to the new order of things. In the mean time all the late advocates of the doctrine of passive obedience, especially among the clergy, began to feel the inconvenience of their new position, in having to yield allegiance to a king who had become such in clear violation of that doctrine; and while not a few of the Tories, when the flush of feeling in favour of liberalism, which recent events had served to excite, had subsided, relapsed into their old notions, it was found enough to cause jealousy and dissension among the Whigs, that their unreasonable expectations were not always to be accomplished, and that William endeavored to conciliate the Tories by bestowing some of his favors upon them. The cause of good government made progress during the whole reign of William III., but the struggles of faction soon regained their old ascendancy, and with them came the usual amount of violence, intrigue, and corruption, extending alike to the government, the court, and the nation. In short, into so bad a mood did this nation contrive to work itself, that William III., though more eminently entitled to the admiration and gratitude of the English people than any one of our sovereigns since the days of Alfred, is nevertheless a prince who has his place among the least popular of our monarchs. The abuse heaped upon him, and upon his pious and amiable consort, by the Jacobite and extreme Tory factions, was just of that mendacious, malignant, and cowardly complexion, which, judging from what we still find about us, would seem to be the inalienable heritage of Toryism.

Of the reign thus characterized, the 'Letters' of Vernon to the Duke of Shrewsbury, now first published, afford much and valuable illustration. Vernon was a person of respectable family, who obtained, at an early period, an appointment in the office of secretary of state. His subsequent history is briefly given in the following passage from Mr. James's introduction.

'He proceeded slowly, and apparently without acquiring any great distinction, till after the famous revolution of 1688. His perfect knowledge of business and active habits, however, had made themselves conspicuous by that time: and it would appear that he had attracted the attention of the king and the Earl of Shrewsbury. But those were days of doubt and suspicion, and the enemies—perhaps the rivals—of Vernon, took care to insinuate that he was not to be trusted. When Shrewsbury, in the autumn of 1689, showed a desire to resign his post, on account of ill health (as he himself declared), it would seem that Portland was directed by the king to confer with him regarding

the nomination of some person to relieve him from a part of the toils of office, either as under-secretary of state, or in some similar capacity. Vernon was then spoken of, but objected to by the king, in whose reasons for excluding him we find Shrewsbury coinciding in the following strong terms:—‘Upon discourse with my Lord Portland,’ he says, in his letter to William, of the date 11th of September, 1689, ‘I find what your Majesty had already hinted to me concerning Mr. Vernon, to be thought by many, only with this aggravation, that whereas people have an ill opinion of Dr. Wynn, as suspecting his disaffection only to this government, they have a prejudice to the other's morals in general, and think this was not observed when he was under Mr. Fenton. But he can be faithful to none now, it seems.’ Not long after this letter was written Shrewsbury found additional motives for urging the king to accept his resignation, and finally sent the seals to William, by the Earl of Portland, on the 2nd June, 1690. He was prevailed upon with the greatest difficulty to return to office, in the spring of 1694, and I am not aware that in this interval Vernon received any promotion. The opinion of the Duke of Shrewsbury, however, must have greatly changed since he wrote the letter above cited, as very shortly after, having again accepted the seals as Secretary of State, that minister engaged Mr. Vernon as his private secretary. After this he was employed in various important affairs, but still, as is too often the case, his merits and his claims, apparently undervalued by others, so that, in the year 1697, even after he had conducted, with the greatest skill and wisdom, the unfortunate affair of Sir John Fenwick to a close, we find him likely to be left utterly unprovided for, having lost a place in the Prize Office by the peace, and having no longer a post in the Secretary of State's office. Thus, at the close of that year, though Vernon was an able and useful member of the House of Commons, Shrewsbury himself, on the eve of retiring from office for ever, was only bold enough to ask the king for a small colonial appointment, for a man who had served him so faithfully. He thus writes to William, who was then in Holland, on the 6th October, o.s., 1697: ‘Having a very great compassion for Mr. Vernon's circumstances, who has a numerous family and has lost his place in the Prize Office by the peace, and will now be out of employment in Secretary of State's office, I have writ to him upon it, and find his modesty is such as he would be satisfied with Blaneard's place in Jamaica, which I hope your majesty will please to grant him, for I am sure you have not a more faithful, and not many more capable servants in the kingdom.’

‘Yet, strange to say, the complicated state of political intrigue existing at that moment, was likely to elevate the very object of the duke's compassion to the high office he was going to resign; and by some of Vernon's own letters, it is made evident that that Lord Sunderland, the chamberlain, if not the king himself, had determined, should Shrewsbury persist in resigning suddenly, to place Vernon at once in the office, rather than allow the more zealous Whigs to seize upon it for the benefit of Wharton, who was personally obnoxious to the king. Such was probably the result, had not the sud-

den and unexpected resignation of Sir William Trumbull left another office of equal importance vacant. It is evident that the resignation of Trumbull, who had been long on ill terms with the rest of the ministers, was urged on by the intrigues of some of the Whig leaders, in order to thrust Lord Wharton into the office thus left free; though if such were the case it is to be supposed from his letters that the lord keeper Somers was not aware of the manœuvre. No sooner however was the resignation of the secretary of state known, than his successor was determined upon by the king and the Earl of Sunderland. In order not to offend Lord Wharton or Lord Tankerville, who were both put forward as aspirants to office, the reason assigned for the king's decision in favour of Vernon was the service he might render the state in the House of Commons, of which he was a member of some distinction; and on the 2nd of December, A. D. 1697, Mr. Vernon was appointed secretary of state. He showed considerable diffidence in accepting the office, but the course of his life after this period, at which time he was about the age of fifty-four, as well as the minute particulars of almost all the great events occurring in England during the subsequent ten years, are to be found recorded in the letters that follow, and therefore they do not require to be enlarged on in this place.'—pp. iv.—ix.

In the letters of such a man, our readers will not expect to find any marked indications of genius or profound thought. As they are letters also to a superior, and from one who is never for a moment unmindful of that fact, they have little of the free and lighter qualities of composition, which often give so much charm to productions of this nature, touching upon all sorts of occurrences as they arose. In short, Vernon's letters are uniformly the grave communications of the assiduous, discreet man of business, omitting mention of nothing affecting the state of parties or of the government at the time, but touching upon them all with a modesty and brevity which the reader may sometimes wish had been a little dispensed with. The 'Correspondence' of the Duke of Shrewsbury was published some time since. The letters of Vernon should have their place with that publication, and should be consulted carefully by every reader who would possess more than a superficial acquaintance with the reign of William III. A few extracts will serve, perhaps, better than any description we may give, to convey a just idea of these papers. The following account of a Westminster election, will show that things were done in that quarter in 1701, much as we know them to have been done a century later.

'I have not seen the king since, being engaged to a Westminster election, which happily ended in a much shorter time than it used to do. The poll only lasted three days, by reason it was taken in Covent Garden church porch, and many desks were employed, so that six or

seven could poll at a time, and every body that came was presently dispatched.

‘ Sir John Leveson Gower was set up against me, upon a very plausible pretence. He having brought in the bill that takes away the privilege of parliament in cases of debt, which several tradesmen have found a benefit by, and great use was made of it to recommend him to all the rest. In probability the argument would have prevailed more if he had not been liable to exceptions by his warm behaviour in the House upon other points, which made the Whigs in general great sticklers against him, and engaged them for Sir Harry Colt.

‘ I was over persuaded by some, whom I thought leading men, to join with Cross, who served for Westminster in the last parliament. When I did it, I did not know that Sir Harry was such a favorite, the turn being made of a sudden; nor could I imagine that Cross was so obnoxious as I found afterwards. I am still ignorant how he voted last session, but the cry ran that he herded among the Tories. However, having given him my word, I would not be persuaded to separate from him; I thought that too mean and infamous.

‘ The event has justified it, since I maintained my integrity without losing the election. I only lost my solicitations on his behalf, people being obstinately averse to him, which I was so just as to tell him as soon as I perceived it.

At the conclusion of our poll the votes stood thus: for

Sir Harry Colt . . . 3013	Mr. Cross 1649
The Secretary . . . 2997	Sir John Leveson Gower 1633

‘ Lord Somers, Lord Orford, and Lord Halifax, espoused Sir Harry’s interest very warmly, when they declared for him, which was not till four or five days after the dissolution; and when they saw Sir John Leveson Gower resolved to stand there, which kept them two from joining, they sent me word they did not intend me any prejudice by it. I do not know how many votes they made me, but I think they took none from me.

‘ I have since been with my Lord Halifax, and made my compliments, so that all matters seem to be pretty well forgot, and perhaps there was no need of their having been remembered so long.

‘ I wish the people all over England would choose with the same spirit they have done in Westminster, London, and Southwark, where they have shown a great aversion to Jacobitism, and a French faction, notwithstanding the powerful endeavors to support it.

‘ My Lord Chamberlain sent to his tradesmen in behalf of Sir John Leveson Gower, as he writ to Cambridge for Mr. Hammond. My lord keeper’s steward polled here for Sir John only, and two of his chaplains took a journey to Cambridge to do the like for Mr. Hammond.

‘ The Duke of Bedford was drawn in by some ladies to send about to his tenants and militia officers, that they should not fail to poll for Sir John; on the other side the Duke of Somerset recommended Sir Harry only.

‘I believe your grace has the lists sent you of the new choice, which contains many of the old members, and some of the hottest, only Hammond and Davenant happen to be dropped.’

—vol. iii., p. 159—162.

But this was moderation, compared with the scene exhibited by the partisans of Vernon and this Sir Harry, about four years previously.

‘Your grace can hardly imagine what fatigue there is in an election at Westminster, and especially when one has to do with so obstinate a creature as Sir Harry Colt.

‘We had a mighty appearance against him in the field, both of horse and foot, who run down his men at a strange rate, and cudgelled them into ditches full of water, and yet we say they were the aggressors.

‘Notwithstanding this, Sir Harry demanded the poll, and I believe he was glad his fellows were banged, that he might have a pretence to petition the house. We went immediately to the poll, which lasted till seven at night. I must say, that for Sir Harry, there was never more industry, nor more artifices used to carry his point; and I know not what would have been the event if he had either been beloved or esteemed, or kept up any reputation among the civilized part of mankind. He has his rabble under such discipline that almost every one of them polls for him singly, and his sparks being on foot, had the advantage of being first at the place where the poll was taken, while the horsemen were all obliged to go home, and thought no more of it for that day; by these means he thought he had got a great victory. When the poll was cast up that night—

For Sir Harry	222
For Mr. Montague	189
And for myself	171

‘But he has received a check to-day; the poll, when we adjourned at dinner-time, running—

‘For Mr. Montague	501
‘For me	487
‘For Sir Harry	292

‘The poll since dinner was—

‘For Mr. Montague	242
‘For myself	239
‘For Sir Harry	186

‘So that, as it now stands, Mr. Montague is about thirty-five before me, and I have only 197 voices more than Sir Harry; and if night had not come on, the inequality would have been greater. To say the truth, he has such a mob that any one but he would be ashamed to be chosen by them. He has not one gentleman in his list, but has

picked up the very scum of the town,—victuallers, porters, and chairmen. Patch, your grace's footman, is as one of his voters, and stated himself gentleman. He has collected all the papists; two of them, being notorious ones, were caught, and the oaths tendered them, as the asseveration act directs, which they refusing, were hissed off.'

—vol. ii., pp. 135—137.

The following passages are instructive, as bearing upon the character and circumstances of the Nonconformists in that age.

‘I have another matter to acquaint your grace with by my lord chancellor's direction. It has been taken notice of for some time, that the independent congregations have formed themselves into a fraternity, begun at first for the management of their own societies; and they have since enlarged themselves by the addition of some others, who have associated with them under the pretence of a reformation of manners. They have appointed a general meeting, and there are beside several private cabals, and many discontented persons of all persuasions are endeavoring to herd among them.

‘My lord archbishop apprehends their design may be to undermine the church, and my lord chancellor thinks they rather aim at discrediting the administration, which they represent as atheistical, and designing to drive Christianity out of the world.

‘The king being acquainted of this growing sect, thinks it is of great consequence to have all their proceedings observed. My lord chancellor is for finding out all ways of getting into their secret, and in the same clandestine manner to work against them, that if it were possible they might be defeated without noise. Among other instruments proper for this purpose, he thinks good use might be made of Mr. Griffith, the Independent minister, both as your grace has a good influence over him, and as he is looked upon to be a man of probity, who, however he may be zealous in his way, would not knowingly admit of a mixture that under specious pretences should be laboring to subvert the government.

‘His lordship thinks your grace might engage him to be watchful in this matter, and to communicate to my lord chancellor, or to me, if he thinks that would be the least taken notice of, what he observes of these designs. He need not be shy of opening himself as to the innocent part of it, which concerns their own congregations only; for that giving no jealousy to the government, will not be made use of to create them any disturbance; but the thing we would know is, what discontented churchmen or discarded statesmen mean by insinuating themselves into their familiarities. My lord chancellor believes he would choose rather to see me. Some other ways will likewise be taken to come at the bottom of this machination.’

—vol. ii., pp. 128—130.

About a week later we find the following:—

‘I have been talking with Mr. Owen, whom your grace knows to be considerable among the dissenters, and inquired of him at a dis-

tance, if there were any societies formed for the reformation of manners? He told me there was one which had subsisted these seven or eight years, but had met with discouragement from the late commissioners of the great seal.

‘I suppose the meaning of that must be, that these zealots applied to them, that some, whom they thought loose in their morals, and not fitted to carry on the work of reformation, might be put out of the commission of the peace. But the commissioners did not think fit to affront men, for what they called a want of grace.

‘He says these gentlemen have still their meetings, and that there are about fifty or sixty of them. I would not show so great prying as to ask their names, and he did not tell me any of them; but I perceive the business he is driving at, at present, is the more easy conviction of those who are guilty of swearing. He would have a justice of peace levy a fine in that case, without sending for the party accused, or letting him know who is the informer, which he says would only be to expose that sort of men to be knocked at the head.

‘He doubts whether this will be allowed to be according to the received rules of law, which provides that no man shall be condemned unheard, and that the party may expect to have his accuser face to face; but he thinks it justifiable by the prerogative of the king of heaven, whose honor ought to be vindicated by extraordinary methods. He seems resolved to make the trial of it, and so go on until he finds it disapproved by the courts at Westminster.

‘Your grace will easily imagine that such an inquisition will not be borne in this kingdom, let the pretence be what it will. He thinks there are not above three or four justices that would join with him, and the rest are remiss and dissolute, and perhaps fitter to be removed than continued.

‘I find these reformers are people of all persuasions, as well churchmen as dissenters, so that it is not the interest of any particular sect they would promote, but the general good of mankind, by introducing a conformity of manners, and a primitive purity. This is a pretty temper to be worked upon, if designing persons get amongst them, and if they grow to any strength. I know not what models they may have for establishing saintships. I am inclined to be of opinion that this may be a way to set up hypocrisy, but will not much advance real honesty or virtue.’—vol. ii., pp. 133, 134.

About a month later great alarm was taken, because a body of nonconformists had met as a sort of synod or association at Newbury, of which the very circumspect Mr. Griffith expressed his grave disapproval.

‘This passion of theirs,’ says Vernon, ‘has appeared more barefaced in Ireland, where they have had such an assembly at Antrim, and published the sermon preached upon the occasion, maintaining it was their right and duty to meet, with or without the allowance of the laws, or the consent of the supreme magistrate. The episcopal clergy intend to remonstrate to the government against this liberty. I know not

how soon we may expect the like to be done in England, and if it break into an open contest about church discipline, the moderate man will have a fine time of it.'—vol. ii., pp. 156, 157.

The following passage is a fair specimen of the greedy temper of the times. The Harry Griffith mentioned, is the son of Griffith, the Independent minister, for whose services, as somewhat too much like a spy upon his brethren, it was deemed expedient to do something in the way of reward.

' The next post may tell us what his Majesty says to the disposal of the auditor's place. If it were consistent with the first commissioner's, his friends would rather he should have it so, and perhaps his enemies too, if there might be more to cavil at on that side. I have spoken to him about Harry Griffith: he is well disposed in his favor. But there is nothing vacant, *and when it happens, pretenders are infinite.*

' A prebend of Worcester fell lately void. I spoke to the archbishop and went to the bishop of Salisbury, in behalf of Mr. Vernon; but the bishop of Worcester is like to carry it away for his son. *God help this poor man, if the rich and the young are all to be preferred before him!*'—vol. ii., pp. 173, 174.

In conclusion, we commend these volumes, as not without considerable interest to the general reader, and as highly valuable to the historian.

Art. III. *Poems by a Slave in the Island of Cuba, recently liberated; Translated from the Spanish, by R. R. MADDEN, M.D., with the History of the early Life of the Negro Poet written by himself. To which are prefixed two Pieces descriptive of Cuban Slavery and the Slave Traffic.* By R. R. M. London: Ward and Co.

THIS is a volume of more than ordinary interest, whether regarded in a literary or in a moral point of view. It contains the autobiography and poems of an African slave in the island of Cuba, and satisfactorily disposes of the theory long prevalent amongst us of the essential inferiority of the African intellect. Our philosophers, in descanting on the origin and history of the human family, have strangely overlooked some of the most important facts bearing on the case which they have undertaken so dogmatically to decide. The color of the skin or the conformation of the skull has been deemed sufficient evidence of an essential variety in the human species, whilst the

uncultivated and barbarous habits prevalent amongst some races have been adduced as proofs of a necessary and hopeless inferiority. The haste with which such conclusions have been drawn awakens the suspicion that the mind of the reasoner has not been wholly free from sinister influences,—that some unacknowledged element has been admitted into his mental process, which has served to destroy its simplicity, and to conduct it to an unwarranted and prejudiced conclusion. Nor would it be difficult for the most part to discover what this influence has been. European pride contemptuously spurns the brotherhood of an enslaved and brutalized race, or an ill-suppressed infidelity seeks to undermine the authority of revelation by invalidating its account of the origin and history of man. Facts which are easily resolvable into causes of daily operation, are made the basis of a theory friendly to human pride or conducive to the ends of an unscrupulous and irrational scepticism. Let the history of the European and the African families have been reversed, let the former have been subjected for centuries to the degradation and cruelty which have befallen the latter, and the latter have been blessed with the culture and moral training which the former have possessed, and the relative position of the two parties at the present day would be the very opposite of what it is. Science, and good government, and religious hope would be the heritage of the now degraded children of Africa, whilst the efforts of philanthropists and the interpositions of civilized governments would have been needed to rescue Europeans from the depths of their degradation and wretchedness. There is nothing in the nature of the case which should lead us to doubt that the African intellect would have borne fruit as liberally as that of Europe, had it been cultivated with equal generosity and skill. We have been so long accustomed to regard the negroes as a degraded and brutalized race that many of our countrymen will probably regard with extreme incredulity the genuineness of these poems. The following is Dr. Madden's statement on this point, and it will be perfectly satisfactory to those who have the honor of that gentleman's acquaintance.

‘A collection of poems written by a slave recently liberated in the Island of Cuba, was presented to me in the year 1838, by a gentleman at Havana, a Creole, highly distinguished, not only in Cuba, but in Spain, for his literary attainments. Some of these pieces had fortunately found their way to the Havana, and attracted the attention of the literary people there, while the poor author was in slavery in the neighborhood of Matanzas. The gentleman to whom I have alluded, with the assistance of a few friends, of pursuits similar to his own—(for literature, even at the Havana, has its humanizing influence), redeemed this poor fellow from slavery, and enabled him to publish

such of his poems as were of a publishable kind in a country like Cuba, where slavery is under the especial protection, and knowledge under the ban of the censors of the press.

‘A few of those pieces which were unpublished or unpublishable in Cuba, I have endeavored to put into English verse; and to the best of my ability, have tried to render, so as to give the sense of the writer (sometimes purposely obscured in the original) as plainly as the spirit of the latter, and the circumstances under which these pieces were written, would admit of. I am sensible I have not done justice to these poems, but I trust I have done enough to vindicate in some degree the character of negro intellect, at least the attempt affords me an opportunity of recording my conviction, that the blessings of education and good government are only wanting to make the natives of Africa, intellectually and morally, equal to the people of any nation on the surface of the globe.’—Pref., pp. i., ii.

The volume contains an interesting account of the early life of the poet written by himself. It was drawn up in two parts, but the second part having fallen into the hands of persons connected with his former master, is not likely, Dr. Madden says, to be recovered. A literal translation is given of the first part, which contains in the judgment of the editor ‘the most ‘perfect picture of Cuban slavery that ever has been given to ‘the world.’ It is a fearful and revolting spectacle which this touching piece of autobiography discloses to our view. It exhibits the evils usually attendant on irresponsible power even when the subjects of that power are placed in the most favorable circumstances of which their fortune admits, and may well serve to awaken our gratitude to the supreme Disposer of events for the triumphant issue of our own abolition struggle. A few brief extracts from the narrative will do more to inform our readers of the true nature of Spanish slavery than anything we can say. It is merely necessary to remark that the writer was a domestic slave employed in attendance on persons of respectability and rank.

‘I had already at the age of twelve years composed some verses in memory, because my godfather did not wish me to learn to write; but I dictated my verses by stealth to a young mulatto girl, of the name of Serafina, which verses were of an amatory character. From this age, I passed on without many changes in my lot to my fourteenth year; but the important part of my history began when I was about eighteen, when fortune’s bitterest enmity was turned on me.

‘For the slightest crime of boyhood it was the custom to shut me up in a place for charcoal, for four and twenty hours at a time. I was timid in the extreme; and my prison, which still may be seen, was so obscure, that at mid-day no object could be distinguished in it without a candle. Here, after being flogged, I was placed, with orders to the slaves, under threats of the greatest punishment, to abstain from giving

me a drop of water. What I suffered from hunger and thirst, tormented with fear, in a place so dismal and distant from the house, and almost suffocated with the vapors arising from the common sink, that was close to my dungeon, and constantly terrified by the rats that passed over me and about me, may be easily imagined. My head was filled with frightful fancies, with all the monstrous tales I had ever heard of ghosts, and apparitions, and sorcery ; and often when a troop of rats would arouse me with their noise, I would imagine I was surrounded by evil spirits, and I would roar aloud, and pray for mercy ; and then I would be taken out and almost flayed alive, again shut up, and the key taken away, and kept in the room of my mistress, the Senora herself. On two occasions, the Senor Don Nicholas and his brother showed me compassion, introducing through an aperture in the door a morsel of bread and some water, with the aid of a coffee-pot with a long spout. This kind of punishment was so frequent that there was not a week that I did not suffer it twice or thrice, and in the country on the estate I suffered a like martyrdom. I attribute the smallness of my stature and the debility of my constitution to the life of suffering I led, from my thirteenth or fourteenth year.

‘ My ordinary crimes were—not to hear the first time I was called ; or if at the time of getting a buffet, I uttered a word of complaint ; and I led a life of so much misery, daily receiving blows on my face, that often made the blood spout from both my nostrils ; no sooner would I hear myself called than I would begin to shiver, so that I could hardly keep on my legs, but supposing this to be only shamming on my part, frequently would I receive from a stout negro lashes in abundance.....

‘ Some attacks of the ague, which nearly ended my days, prevented me from accompanying my mistress to Havana. When I recovered, no one could enjoy himself in two years as I did in four months.

‘ When I recovered sufficiently, my first destiny was to be a page, as well in Havana as in Matanzes ; already I was used to sit up from my earliest years the greatest part of the night, in the city, either at the theatre, or at parties, or in the house of the Marquis M——H—— and the senoras C. If during the tertullia I fell asleep, or when behind the volante (chariot), if the lanthorn went out by accident, even as soon as we arrived, the mayoral, or administrator, was called up, and I was put for the night in the stocks, and at day-break I was called to an account, not as a boy : and so much power has sleep over a man, four or five nights seldom passed that I did not fall into the same faults. My poor mother and brothers more than twice sat up waiting for me while I was in confinement, waiting a sorrowful morning.

‘ Three times I remember the repetition of this scene ; at other times I used to meet my mother seeking me—once above all, a memorable time to me—when the event which follows happened :—We were returning from the town late one night, when the volante was going very fast, and I was seated, as usual, with one hand holding the bar, and having the lanthorn in the other, I fell asleep, and it fell out of my hand ; on awaking, I missed the lanthorn, and jumped down

to get it ; but such was my terror, that I was unable to come up with the volante. I followed, well knowing what was to come, but when I came close to the house, I was seized by Don Sylvester, the young mayoral. Leading me to the stocks, we met my mother, who giving way to the impulses of her heart, came up to complete my misfortunes. On seeing me, she attempted to inquire what I had done, but the mayoral ordered her to be silent, and treated her as one raising a disturbance. Without regard to her entreaties, and being irritated at being called up at that hour, he raised his hand, and struck my mother with the whip. I felt the blow in my own heart ! To utter a loud cry, and from a downcast boy, with the timidity of one as meek as a lamb, to become all at once like a raging lion, was a thing of a moment —with all my strength I fell on him with teeth and hands, and it may be imagined how many cuffs, kicks, and blows were given in the struggle that ensued.

‘ My mother and myself were carried off and shut up in the same place ; the two twin children were brought to her, while Florence and Fernando were left weeping alone in the hut. Scarcely it dawned, when the mayoral, with two negroes acting under him, took hold of me and my mother, and led us as victims to the place of sacrifice. I suffered more punishment than was ordered, in consequence of my attack on the mayoral. But who can describe the powers of the laws of nature on mothers ? the fault of my mother was, that seeing they were going to kill me, as she thought, she inquired what I had done, and this was sufficient to receive a blow and to be further chastised. At beholding my mother in this situation, for the first time in her life (she being exempted from work), stripped by the negroes and thrown down to be scourged, overwhelmed with grief and trembling, I asked them to have pity on her for God’s sake ; but at the sound of the first lash, infuriated like a tiger, I flew at the mayoral, and was near losing my life in his hands ; but let us throw a veil over the rest of this doleful scene.....

‘ I served the breakfast, and when I was going to take the first morsel (taking advantage of the moment to eat something), my mistress ordered me to go to the mayoral’s house, and tell him—I do not remember what. With sad forebodings, and an oppressed heart, being accustomed to deliver myself up on such occasions, away I went trembling. When I arrived at the door, I saw the mayoral of the Molino, and the mayoral of the Ingenio, together. I delivered my message to the first, who said, ‘ Come in, man ; ’ I obeyed, and was going to repeat it again, when Senor Dominguez, the mayoral of the Ingenio, took hold of my arm, saying, ‘ It is to me to whom you are sent ; ’ took out of his pocket a thin rope, tied my hands behind me as a criminal, mounted his horse, and commanded me to run quick before him, to avoid either my mother or my brothers seeing me. Scarcely had I run a mile before the horse, stumbling at every step, when two dogs that were following us, fell upon me ; one taking hold of the left side of my face pierced it through, and the other lacerated my left thigh and leg in a shocking manner, which wounds are open yet, notwithstanding it happened twenty-four years ago. The mayoral alighted on the moment,

and separated me from their grasp, but my blood flowed profusely, particularly from my leg—he then pulled me by the rope, making use, at the same time, of the most disgusting language ; this pull partly dislocated my right arm, which at times pains me yet. Getting up, I walked as well as I could, till we arrived at the Ingenio. They put a rope round my neck, bound up my wounds, and put me in the stocks. At night, all the people of the estate were assembled together, and arranged in a line. I was put in the middle of them, the mayoral and six negroes surrounded me, and at the word ‘Upon him,’ they threw me down ; two of them held my hands, two my legs, and the other sat upon my back. They then asked me about the missing capon, and I did not know what to say. Twenty-five lashes were laid on me. They then asked me again to tell the truth, I was perplexed ; at last, thinking to escape further punishment, I said ‘I stole it.’ ‘What have you done with the money?’ was the next question, and this was another trying point. ‘I bought a hat.’ ‘Where is it?’ ‘I bought a pair of shoes.’ ‘No such thing,’ and I said so many things to escape punishment, but all to no purpose. Nine successive nights the same scene was repeated, and every night I told a thousand lies. After the whipping, I was sent to look after the cattle and work in the fields. Every morning my mistress was informed of what I said the previous night. At the end of ten days, the cause of my punishment being known, Dionisio Copandonga, who was the carrier who brought the fowls, went to the mayoral, and said that the missed capon was eaten by the steward Don Manuel Pipa, and which capon was left behind in a mistake ; the cook Simona was examined, and confirmed the account. I do not know whether my mistress was made acquainted with this transaction ; but certain it is, that since that moment my punishment ceased, my fetters were taken off, and my work eased, and a coarse linen dress was put on me..... I was presented to my mistress, who for the first time received me with kindness. But my heart was so oppressed, that neither her kindness, nor eating, nor drinking could comfort me ; I had no comfort except in weeping ; my mistress observing it, and to prevent me crying so much, and the same time being so very drowsy, ordered me to move about, and clean all the furniture, tables, chairs, drawers, &c. All my liveliness disappeared, and as my brother was greatly attached to me, he became melancholy himself ; he tried, however, to cheer me up, but always finished our conversations in tears : for this reason, also, my mistress would not let me wait upon her, nor ride in the volante to town ; and at last appointed me to the service of young Master Pancho ; they bought me a hat and a pair of shoes—a new thing for me—and my master allowed me to bathe, to take a walk in the afternoon, and to go fishing and hunting with Senor.’

The two longest poems, entitled *The Slave Trade Merchant* and *The Sugar Estate*, are Dr. Madden's own productions, and would afford matter for interesting extract if the claims of his protégé were not paramount. We have selected the following, not as the best specimens, but as most suited to our limits.

‘TO CALUMNY.

‘Silence, audacious wickedness which aims
At honor’s breast, or strikes with driftless breath
The lightest word that’s spoken thus defames,
And where it falls, inflicts a moral death.

‘If with malign, deliberate intent,
The shaft is sped, the bow that vibrates yet,
One day will hurt the hand by which ’tis bent,
And leave a wound its malice justly met.

‘For once the winged arrow is sent forth,
Who then may tell where, when, or how ’twill fall ?
Or, who may pluck its barb from wounded worth,
And send it back, and swiftly too withal.’—p. 97.

‘THIRTY YEARS.

‘When I think on the course I have run,
From my childhood itself to this day,
I tremble, and fain would I shun,
The remembrance its terrors array.

‘I marvel at struggles endured,
With a destiny frightful as mine,
At the strength for such efforts :—assured,
Tho’ I am, ’tis in vain to repine.

‘I have known this sad life thirty years,
And to me, thirty years it has been
Of suff’ring, of sorrow, and tears,
Ev’ry day of its bondage I’ve seen.

‘But ’tis nothing the past—or the pains,
Hitherto I have struggled to bear,
When I think, oh, my God ! on the chains,
That I know I’m yet destined to wear.’—p. 101.

‘THE CLOCK THAT GAINS.

‘The clock’s too fast they say ;
But what matter, how it gains !
Time will not pass away
Any faster for its pains.

‘The tiny hands may race
Round the circle, they may range,
The sun has but one pace,
And his course he cannot change.

‘ The beams that daily shine
On the dial, err not so,
For they’re ruled by laws divine,
And they vary not, we know.

‘ But tho’ the clock is fast,
Yet the moments I must say,
More slowly never passed,
Than they seemed to pass to-day.’—p. 105.

The remaining contents of the volume throw considerable light on the social and religious state of the slaves in Cuba, and on the fearful extent to which the slave trade is still carried on in that island. It is justly remarked by Dr. Madden, that ‘the portraiture of a battle affects us less than that of a single captive such as Sterne depicted.’ Let our readers peruse the following, and then say what should be the extent of our efforts to rescue the African race from their unutterable misery.

‘ Let me present to the imagination a real captive—one that has recently fallen under my own observation, and, I may add, under my own charge—one into whose soul the iron of affliction had verily and indeed entered—a single sufferer, a negress, taken out of a captured slaver, a wan, emaciated, listless, silent woman, a sullen savage, in the phraseology of Cuba, in cases of anguish and despair—a person who neither spoke nor moved from the spot where she sat rocking her naked body to and fro all day long. There was a calm settled look of deep, unspeakable wretchedness in her regard, which made me dissatisfied with the explanation I received of the strangeness of her conduct, that she was a sulky negress, and showed no thankfulness for anything that was done for her, like the other women. The others were dressed in the new apparel which had been just given them, enjoying the good fare now provided for them, and celebrating with songs and dances the happy change in their lot. I thought she must have great reason for such dejection; the poor thing left the food untouched that was brought to her at each meal; her new clothing lay folded up beside her; when she was asked through the interpreter to tell what ailed her, she gave no reply; day after day she was questioned, and deep sighs were the only answers that could be got from her.

‘ Negroes are said by planters to be insensible to kindness; they, no doubt, have so many benefits to be grateful for, that any thanklessness, on their parts, is too glaring a defect to pass unnoticed. The kindness that was shown to this poor creature was apparently thrown away, but apparently only, for by little and little it subdued the sternness of her grief; and what grief could surpass her afflictions—for her’s was that of a mother robbed of her infant child? One day I stooped down to speak to her, and endeavored to ascertain the cause of her trouble, while I was offering her some beads, such as I had given to some of her companions, she burst out crying. It seemed at last as if

she had found ease, in giving vent to one loud outbreak of sobs and sighs. She wept bitterly, put her hands to her breast, then stretched out her arms, started up on her feet, and, looking wildly over the side of the vessel, cried out for her child—and over and over again she repeated the words—in fact this was her cry the live-long day. Ask her what you would, 'the cry of the heart,' continually was—'for her child.' It was long before this tempest of sorrow was assuaged sufficiently to obtain from her any collected account of the loss of her infant. It appeared that when the slaver was chased by our cruiser, fifty of the negroes were thrown overboard (twenty-four of whom were picked up by the cruiser's boats), with the view of detaining the latter vessel, and of thus eluding the pursuit; and this part of the story was confirmed by the account of the humane and resolute captor himself, by the account given to me by Captain Hollond, of the whole affair, off the Isle of Pines. And during this commotion on board the slaver, and the mortal terror at seeing their comrades flung overboard, this unfortunate woman lost her infant, but how, or at what period it was taken from her, she could not tell. No creature could seem more sensible of the sympathy that was felt for her than this poor woman. But how often have I been told these people are savages—they have no natural affections—the separation of families is nothing to them—the sundering of the ties that bind mothers to children, and children to parents, is nothing to negroes! They do admit that even the she-bear will pine after her lost cubs; but the grief of a negro mother for her child is only a gust of passion that proceeds, not from any emotions of the heart, but from the violence of the irascible temper of negro women. Oh! how often have I heard this language, and how often have I known these sentiments adopted by men—aye, even by ministers of religion, who tell you, in Cuba, as well as in America, they see no hardships in slavery—that the slaves are kindly treated, are well fed, and decently clad, and have nothing to complain of! What do these gentlemen know of slavery? They eat and drink, no doubt, at the houses of the opulent planters in the towns, and they reason on the strength of the goodness of their entertainments, that the slaves of their hosts are treated like their guests.'—pp. 158—160.

Dr. Madden is entitled to the thanks of every humane man for the publication of this volume, which we strongly recommend to the immediate and attentive perusal of our readers.

Art. IV. *Notes on the Pentateuch; Selected from the Exegetical Parts of Rosenmüller's Scholia and of Dathe's Notes to his Latin Version; also from Schrank, Michaelis, Le Clerc, Ainsworth, Poole, and other authors.* By T. BRIGHTWELL. 1 Vol. 12mo. London: Ball and Co.

THE greatest perils to the cause of sacred truth have generally arisen among the learned. The most pestilent and prevailing heresy of the present day has its fountain and its seat in one of our learned universities, and numbers among its advocates men of undoubted eminence both for erudition and talent. Were we to sketch the history of the various errors which have corrupted the church in successive ages, we might trace them all, or nearly all, to men of high reputation as scholars and divines, who appeared either as their originators or their patrons and defenders.

The main question agitated at the present moment relates to the interpretation of the Scriptures. Certain theological sages of Oxford have assumed, plainly and without guise, the dogma of the papacy, as set forth in the writings of Bellarmine and the decrees of the Council of Trent, that the church is the authoritative or final interpreter of Scripture, and that the living church is bound by the dead church, and must ascertain the truth by an appeal to tradition, as this flows down to us from the fathers of the fourth and fifth century. Within the Established Church this opinion has recently advanced with incredible rapidity, and has, we fear, left the genuine Protestant doctrines in a minority, the proportion of which to the numbers who advocate the favorite doctrine, we dare not trust ourselves to conjecture. It is not, however, our intention at present to descant upon these deplorable facts, and the consequences into which they are ripening. We allude to them for the purpose of placing them in contrast with other facts.

We are now threatened with the re-establishment of the first principles of popery, and, at no distant day, if the seed takes root and flourishes, as the spiritual husbandmen no doubt anticipate, we shall see it blossoming with all those precious fruits which appear upon the parent stock. But how diverse and capricious are the speculations of learned men! Little more than a century ago they were travelling in the opposite direction. Then, there was the most imminent danger lest reason and philosophy should usurp to themselves the exclusive right of interpreting Scripture, and banish from the creed of the Church everything that did not square itself by their rule, and submit to their light. In some respects the danger then was greater and more threatening than it is at present from the

popish dogmas, because the dissenting denominations as well as the Church of England were infested with rationalism: whereas at present, the plague is confined to the stipendiaries of the state; and from its very nature it must remain so. It is not a disease to which the dissenting bodies are at all liable, or with which they can ever be affected. Their very existence depends upon the vigor of the great Protestant principle, 'The Bible, 'the Bible only.' This is the life-blood of the dissenting denominations. It produces them, and they have ever been, and ever will be, its bulwarks. They are united as the heart of one man in its support. We will venture to predict that they will remain so; and that nothing will ever shake their confidence in the stability of their position. The aspect which they assume at the present moment, free from heterodoxy, harmonious, united, and devoted to their great work of evangelizing the masses at home and abroad, sufficiently and satisfactorily shows, that they are no strangers to the nature and bearing of those novelties which are startling and perverting their fellow Christians of the Establishment, and that they are not to be moved from their foundations by those dogmas which were long since tried and found wanting both by the fathers of the Protestant reformation, and the fathers of nonconformity. It has been alleged that the dissenting denominations have not yet come forward, in the defence of their protestantism and refutation of the Oxford Tractists, with that promptitude and ability which might have been expected. Yet it should be observed, in explanation, that the controversy properly pertains not to them—it is not within their borders: something, therefore, is to be attributed to their sense of propriety in leaving it, at least in the first instance, to those whom it more immediately concerns, and within whose precincts it exists. If dissenters have hitherto been in a great measure lookers on, it is attributable to the expectation that some champions for the truth would arise from among the treacherous hosts, who would, like Moses, have stood in the gate of the camp, saying, 'Who is on 'the Lord's side? let him come unto me.' Neither should it be unobserved that the three ablest and most argumentative books which have yet appeared in defence of the Protestant doctrine, have proceeded from authors pertaining rather to the dissenting bodies than to the Church. And if, after all, it should be conceded, that they are not generally prepared to follow the restorers of traditional religion into the sandy and pathless desert of the fathers, there are ample reasons to justify their want of preparation for such unprofitable excursions. They have been ambitious of better studies, and are more familiar with apostles and evangelists. They understand a much shorter way of coming at the truth; and though it may be very desirable to meet the traditionists on their own arena,

and defeat them with their own weapons, as the author of 'Ancient Christianity' has so adroitly done, yet the victory must, after all, be achieved by weapons drawn from the armoury of Scripture itself: and in the use of these the dissenting ministry never have been behind their opponents, and we are confident that in the present controversy, they will not be found wanting. They are laborious and studious men, but their labors and studies have been directed more to the spread of gospel truth, than to the examination of Greek fathers, and the adjustment of controversies which they have deemed long since worn out, at least among Protestants. It ought in justice to be further observed, that the dissenting denominations enjoy no comfortable sinecures, no rich prebendal stalls, no lucrative fellowships, no endowments of any kind that do not exact a full and regular measure of duty. Every man of talent and learning has his hands full—and unless he be a prodigy of labor and industry, he cannot be expected to walk side by side with men who have passed the life of learned recluses in cloisters and colleges, enjoying the *otium cum dignitate* of a rich establishment. And yet it would not surprise us to find, that men may yet appear among them, whose knowledge of Christian antiquity, and discrimination in subtle controversies, would not be disadvantageously matched against the doctors of Oxford. In debate with Catholics, Unitarians, and infidels they have uniformly sustained their part with honor and success, and had they deemed themselves bound to appear prominently in the present controversy, we have no doubt they could have furnished champions fully adequate to the occasion.

We have digressed, however, from the observation with which we started, that the greatest dangers to the cause of revealed truth have always proceeded from the learned, and from the learned of the church. It was not our intention, as may well be conjectured, to add to this any inference to the discredit of learned men, or the disparagement of their learning; because, in our view, it would not hence follow, that the church had been in a better condition if it had never produced such learned men, or been convulsed and endangered by their speculations. That would be a very unfair and unphilosophical argument which should hence conclude unfavorably to the cause of learning in general: not only because such an argument would be merely taken from the abuse of a thing really good in itself, but because it would rest altogether upon the disservice which learning had occasionally and incidently caused, without balancing against it the invaluable services which had proceeded from the same source. If learning, or at least learned men, have originated the heresies, learned men have also furnished the antidote to those heresies. If one class of the

learned have run into one extreme, and another class into another extreme, the result of both has been, like that of two equal and opposite motions, to neutralize each other. Those who more than a hundred years ago were writing up rationalism in England, as the rule of Scripture interpretation, and those who more recently, and much more elaborately, have essayed the same process in Germany, have done their uttermost in one direction to 'make the faith of God of none effect ;' and those who are now endeavoring in another direction, to sustain the cause of a falling Establishment by re-introducing tradition and the authority of the priesthood, in place of the authority of Scripture, are doing their utmost to overbear the testimony of inspiration, and devolve the work of the Spirit into the hands of the bishop and his presbyters. But as, in the one case, the truth of God vindicated itself from the daring presumption of reason and philosophy, and came forth in the efforts of the early and despised Methodists to bless and enlighten the land, so, we can have no doubt, this new extravagance, this re-swaddling of the Church in the bands of its feeble and sickly infancy, will be accompanied or succeeded, either by some glorious development of manly strength within the Church itself, which shall issue in the disgrace and abjection of those ecclesiastical nurses ; or in such a rousing and invigoration of the evangelical sects, as shall bear the masses with them, and accomplish the regeneration of the land ; while the scarlet lady and her restored daughter shall be left to perish in the abyss prepared for them, and for which they are evidently preparing. We pretend not to foresee the issues which wait upon the counsels of the Eternal One, nor to divine the nature of those coming events, which are said to cast their shadows before them ; but no mind that looks abroad over the present aspect of the church of Christ in its several sections, can fail to perceive, that the age of repose and inactivity is past—the time of action, of energy, and of conflict is come. The issues may not be what we expect ; the general dissolution of effete forms, and reproduction of efficient agencies for the conquest of the world to Christ, may not be so near as we may hope ; but surely the note of preparation and of warning has sounded ; incipient measures have been taken ; the faithful of all parties are in an attitude of expectation ; hope beats in every bosom ; even the threatening attitude of foes themselves tells us, that a momentous crisis is approaching, and that great events are laboring in the womb of providence, which ere long shall crown our hopes and conspicuously show us that 'the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.'

The question of interpreting Scripture has seduced us into these observations, which we would readily continue, but that we design to take up the subject shortly in connexion with

another recent publication, which will afford us an opportunity of entering more appropriately and fully upon the *vexata questio* of the Oxford Churchmen.

The received doctrine of all Protestant churches has long been, that Scripture is its own interpreter, supposing that it is perfectly intelligible upon all matters of faith and practice essential to salvation, and that no other interpreter is required but an humble and teachable mind, aided by that divine influence which each is directed to seek, and assured he shall receive, if he seek aright through Christ Jesus. Beyond this, however, it may be justly said, there are many things, not indeed necessary to the efficiency of faith, or the integrity of practice, which are hard to be understood, but which we may lawfully endeavor to elucidate by the aid of such knowledge or criticism as we can bring to bear upon the letter of Scripture; observing at the same time, that, as the word of God was intended for the use of all men, so it is written according to the common usages of language, and is to be interpreted according to them; and not according to the fanciful notions of mystical recluses, the systems of speculators and theorizers, or the decisions of selfish and interested ecclesiastics. There is one misrepresentation of the great Protestant doctrine of the right of private interpretation, which we observe is now commonly employed by the advocates of ecclesiastical authority both as a scare-crow to frighten the timid from the use of their understandings, and as a falcon to lure the quarry to their net. They endeavor to fasten upon the Protestant doctrine the hideous notion, that every man has a right to put his own sense upon Scripture language, or the sense that he finds most agreeable and convenient; and then they expatiate upon the impiety of sanctioning such a principle, and the dreadful consequences of allowing every man this liberty. Endless errors and schisms, destructive to the church's unity, and equally so of every man's soul, are attributed to this monstrous doctrine. But it is a man of straw. This is not the pure Protestant doctrine—so far from it, we affirm this representation to be the very reverse of the Protestant principle; which is, that no man, no combination of men, has any right, natural or otherwise, to put any sense upon Scripture but that which Scripture itself conveys. Every man is bound by his fear of God, and his responsibility at the judgment seat of Christ, to *hear the word of the Lord.* If every man would hear it, as it addresses him, every man would form the same conceptions of all its principal truths—he would hear enough, and plainly enough, to secure his salvation; and if upon other matters he mistook the word, through any imperfection of his own, wilful or casual, culpable or excusable, he would yet enjoy acceptance of his divine Master. If he will not suffer the word to teach

him, but proceeds to force his own sense upon it, then indeed he incurs the same condemnation with those who 'make the 'word of God of none effect by their tradition.' This may be the case with some who are guided by reason, and not by faith. Yet even this consequence—a consequence which the Scripture itself foretells, is infinitely preferable to the disastrous results of that doctrine, which teaches all the faithful to remove their faith from God's own word, which it assures them they cannot understand, and cannot even attempt to understand without peril to their soul, and to place it implicitly in the decisions of the church, which hereby erects itself above the Scriptures, claiming attributes of truth, certainty, and infallibility, which they insinuate or imply are not to be found by the private student in the Scriptures themselves, however devoutly and humbly he complies with his Saviour's injunction—'Search 'the Scriptures.'

The principle which distinguishes true Protestantism has long been acted upon, and has proved eminently useful in the elucidation of the sacred text. Even Catholic scholars themselves have contributed of their private stores, and submitted their criticisms and explanations to private judgments. We will not say with what propriety they can engage in such a work. But assuredly if they patronize criticism upon parts of the sacred text, they cannot consistently deny to others the right to examine other parts, or even to extend their best judgment to the whole matter of divine revelation. 'Let him that readeth 'understand' for himself, what the will of the Lord is, and then his 'faith will stand, not in the wisdom of men, but in the power 'of God.'

The little work before us contains a judicious selection of notes upon numerous passages of the Pentateuch, from critics and commentators of the highest celebrity. Many of great value are taken from Rosenmüller and Dathe. The student who cannot avail himself of the treasures contained in those voluminous works, will here find a useful selection of their most important and valuable annotations. They are mostly of a critical and explanatory character, and serve to clear up many dark and otherwise inexplicable passages. The work is wholly unsuitable for extract, and we must, therefore, content ourselves with a general recommendation, which we most cordially give to it. We are confident that it will prove a valuable boon to many a poor minister and student who have heard of Rosenmüller and Dathe, but never enjoyed an opportunity of consulting them.

Art. V. *Recherches Administratives, Statistiques, et Morales sur les Enfants Trouvés, les Enfants Naturels, et les Orphelins en France et dans plusieurs autres pays de l'Europe.* Par l'abbé A. H. GAILLARD. Paris et Poitiers. 1839.

2. *Histoire Statistique et Morale des Enfants Trouvés, suivi de cent Tableaux.* Par J. F. TERME et J. B. MONFALCON. Paris et Lyon. 1836.
3. *Des Hospices d'Enfants Trouvés en Europe et principalement en France.* Par B. B. REMACLE. Paris et Strasburgh. 1839.

THERE can be no doubt that the more prominent points of national peculiarity, so characteristic in former ages of the distinct origin of the nations of Europe, have, in a great measure, been polished off in the progress of civilization; yet we cannot agree with those philanthropists who discover in this fact the immediate symptoms of universal peace and general fraternity, nor can we even concur in the opinion of those more sobered philosophers who anticipate from this source a speedy equalization and complete uniformity among the social and political institutions of Europe generally.

It is not our intention in the present article to inquire whether such an uniformity would prove beneficial either to the world at large or to the several nations individually. We are not quite sure that the complete intermixture and blending of the heterogeneous parts would really tend to expand the acquired or inherent faculties of a people, or whether, on the other hand, the exact correspondence of all which must result, would not rather contract the moral and intellectual powers, by narrowing too much the sphere of their operation, and by destroying the opportunities of comparison between one set of national institutions and another. Such questions, though interesting to the speculative philosopher, are destitute of all practical importance; there being, in our opinion, not the slightest chance or possibility of such expectations being realized. As yet the approach of this anticipated resemblance neither strikes the casual observer, nor is detected by the investigations of the close inquirer. On the contrary, the more we contemplate the national institutions of Europe in their various forms and systems, the more do we discover in them views and principles totally different from, if not indeed altogether opposed to, each other. We can only hint at the vast difference that exists in France, England, and Germany with regard to the education of the two sexes, their social and political position, the relations of the nobility, &c.—differences which no one will deny not only originate in the discrepancy of national character, and in the mode of thinking peculiar to the several nations, but which prove likewise the

very means of preserving and developing still further the features of the national spirit. Assuredly none are more mistaken than those who suppose that the various European institutions, resting as they do upon national usages and prejudices, and arising out of original national peculiarities, may ultimately be brought to assume an uniform character by means of the extended intercourse amongst the inhabitants of the civilized globe, whilst even political science—a science based on pure experience in practical life—is still tintured in every country by original views and prejudices. As well might uniformity of language be expected whilst the influences that were coeval with the origin of nations, the bias communicated by the religion of the people, and the prejudices derived from the usages of antiquity are still in active operation.

Such discrepancies are more striking when we meet with them in objects purely philanthropic, as these are a class of objects which apparently admit of but one view and principle. Such phenomena are worth investigating, since they no doubt contain the clue to the original life and character of nations which may have been concealed from our view by the course of time and the march of improvement. Let us thus cast a searching look on the provisions of the legislature in various countries for the support of helpless and friendless children.

That help is here necessary, and indeed that of all charitable institutions those for helpless children are to be placed in the foremost rank, as based upon the primary and direct laws of God, and arising out of the best feelings of our nature, no one denies; and yet the mode and system adopted in each country for effecting the proposed object are found to rest on two different if not opposite views which may be said to divide all the states of Europe into two distinct and characteristic branches. In some countries institutions are established by the state for the reception of *foundlings* indiscriminately, whilst in others the provision is made for *orphans* only, or for those children whose parents are *dead*, either physically, morally, or politically. As all the nations of Roman extraction have adopted the former system, and those of Germanic origin the latter, they have received the specific appellations of *Catholic* and *Protestant* systems,—St. Vincent de Paulo being the hero of Christian charity with the Romanist, whilst Herman Franke is the grand exemplar of the Protestant communities.

The question, then, before us is, of the two systems which is entitled to preference? Are the Germans right in endeavoring, first of all, to enforce from the parents the performance of those duties which natural feeling and which divine precept alike prescribe, and only transferring them to individuals or to institutions appointed by the state authorities in cases of absolute

need, when it is fully ascertained that the parents or nearest relatives are not in a condition to discharge them adequately? And, again, supposing their system to be correct in principle, may it not, on the other hand, be attended by so many evil consequences when reduced to practice as to justify its rejection?

Human law, in asserting that we are bound to take care of our own offspring, does but echo the conclusion at which reason must arrive, and which the concurrent testimony of nature and of revelation proclaims to be correct; and we cannot but feel that society, even in cases of urgency, is more moved by a species of innate compassion for the helpless innocence of childhood than by any sympathy for the erring parents who, in one class of instances, indulge their own heartless sensuality unmindful of the ties of natural affection, or in another class are thoughtless enough to contract a matrimonial alliance without any obvious prospect of supporting the probable issue of the connexion. Of whom, then, may we ask, does that society consist which is so ready to burden itself with the children of these individuals? Does it not mainly consist of those members of the community who have to support families of their own? And how many of these under the Roman Catholic system actually may be under the necessity of denying themselves and their own children a portion of their hardly-earned sustenance, not merely to contribute towards the maintenance of the offspring of those still poorer than themselves, but even to assist in supporting the illegitimate or the deserted progeny of the rich profligate—a privation to which they must quietly submit or choose the more painful and humiliating alternative of breaking up the most tender ties of the household and the house, and flinging their own little ones upon the fatherhood and the protection of the public. The most worthy are those who are made to suffer—as if, indeed, a premium were held out for the destruction of domestic affection. The honest poor man is forced to assist in the support of those whose shameless and heartless parents have *not* been driven to abandon them by the pressure of penury and distress. Furthermore, among those members of society who have no families of their own to provide for, how many individuals, though moving in respectable spheres, yet hesitate to establish a domestic hearth for themselves, and forego the endearments for which they sigh, simply because they dread to incur the attendant responsibility whilst they are not fully assured that they can command the means required to bring up a family properly; yet these, too, are at the same time compelled to contribute their share towards the support of the children of others less worthy and less considerate than themselves. Thus, then, the scheme is unjust in its

operation; nor does the state evince much consistency in principle, in acting upon the Roman Catholic system. Millions of money from the public treasury are here spent with a lavish hand at the mere application of unknown individuals without the least previous investigation as to the justice and necessity of the demand, whilst in all other cases of distress the most scrupulous economy and precaution is observed before a single *sou* is granted. The system, moreover, however laudable in design, tends in a great measure to encourage depravity of morals and of manners, and to increase illicit intercourse between the sexes, the state showing itself ready to meet the evil consequences, to palliate the crime, to remove the attendant difficulties, and to conceal the names and the disgrace of the delinquents,—thus taking away those very circumstances which, if not counteracted, are in themselves the principal checks to licentious indulgence, especially on the part of females.

But, exclaim the advocates of the Roman Catholic system, the German system, however correct in theory and principle, is so replete in practice with fatal results, as to render its adoption altogether impossible, the evil consequences resulting by far outbalancing the benefits to be derived from it. That system, they say, is calculated to drive many a wretched mother to the desperate act of infanticide, either to conceal from the public gaze the fruit of her sin, or to rid herself of the burden of maternal duties. Nor are there wanting, they add, *facts* which sufficiently confirm the alleged inference.

This objection to the German system appears, indeed, at first sight, well founded, as it is hardly possible, with our present habits of feeling and thinking, to suppose that even the most callous mother could divest herself of all natural yearnings after the fruit of her womb; or, if she could do so, that she would be able to set aside the fear of capital punishment in case of discovery, and become the murderer of her own infant, if she knew that she might so readily find the means of removing the causes by which she might otherwise be prompted to the atrocious act. The question here, however, is not one of theoretical probability, but one of real effects. The accounts of those frequent cases of infanticide which have occurred in remote, perhaps barbarous, countries, or in past ages, we shall not take into account as going to prove the fallacy or the correctness of the system, as far different causes than shame, disgrace, and misery, may be assigned as the motives which have led to the perpetration of the crime. Brutal ferocity, frantic hatred against the faithless father, or even a mistaken notion of compassion towards the illegitimate child, and a desire to rescue it from the painful and disgraceful position it must subsequently occupy in society, may, in many instances,

have given rise to infanticide. Religious fanaticism, too, has more than once stained the hand of the parent in the blood of the child; nor is history deficient in instances where whole castes or sects have attempted to exterminate their progeny from a false notion of honor, or the deep-rooted prejudices of national superstition. In order to form a correct judgment as to the expediency and respective merits of the two systems, it is necessary to prove by figures and numerical tables that the number of infanticides in a certain period of time is greater in those civilized countries where the Protestant system prevails than in those where the Roman Catholic system is introduced, although these countries share in every other respect the *same* moral and physical conditions. Such a comparison is, we believe, the only satisfactory method of arriving at the truth in the matter in question, and we shall therefore try to elicit it from the published official criminal statistics in various states.

According to the 'Documens Statistiques sur la France, publiés par le Ministre du Commerce,' the population of France amounted in 1831 to 32,569,223 souls, and the cases of infanticide occurring during the period between 1826 and 1835 inclusive of these years, amounted to 984, or about 98 annually. Now, taking the medium number of the population during that period to have been thirty-two millions, the proportion of infanticide to the whole population would thus be as 1 to 326,530.

Again, in Catholic Ireland, where Foundling Hospitals of a somewhat similar character exist in the larger towns, the number of infanticides from 1826 to 1832 inclusive, was 175, or 25 yearly. Taking the average number of the population during that period to have amounted to 7,500,000 (in 1830 it was 7,767,000), the proportion of infanticides to the entire population would thus be as 1 to 300,000.

In England, on the other hand, where the German system is now acted upon, there occurred in the twenty-four years from 1810 to 1833, no more than 339 cases of infanticide, or rather more than fourteen annually; and as the average population of England and Wales, according to the censuses of 1810, 1820, and 1830, may be estimated during that period at 12,012,275, the proportion of infanticides to the population was therefore as 1 to 856,581. It must not, however, be concealed that in Ireland there was scarcely any secured provision for the destitute poor, whilst in England the parish relief and the workhouse were available for almost all, and that whether their distress arose from sickness or misfortune, or from their own misconduct and idleness. Whilst, therefore, in England the offspring of the really necessitous were in some degree provided for, together with their parents, in Ireland the Foundling Hospital afforded the sole wretched asylum for the miserable children only, and

the mother might deem it better that her little one should be at once destroyed than for it to be sacrificed to lingering and pining sickness, and to the cold charity of strangers. The facts are, nevertheless, sufficient to show that though the doors of the hospital are open to all, yet the Catholic system does not satisfactorily accomplish the object proposed.

In Würtemburg, by the accounts in *Memminger's Annals*, the number of cases of infanticide varies on rather a disproportionate scale. From 1834 to 1836 inclusive, there occurred but four cases, whilst in the preceding eighteen months there were twenty. The fluctuation is the more striking as there were, apparently, not the slightest alterations in progress either in the laws or in the political or commercial situation of the country. It requires therefore more time and experience before any standard proportion can be properly and fairly deduced. At present Würtemburg exhibits a proportion of 1 to 400,000.

In Bade five or six instances occurred from 1830 to 1834 inclusive, presenting a proportion of 1 to 230,000.

The above proportions, though deduced from occurrences neither numerous enough in facts nor sufficiently comprehensive in time to point out with absolute certainty the proportion between the population and the cases of infanticide in the various countries,—yet nevertheless are adequate to show clearly that the absence of Foundling Hospitals does not by any means increase the instances of child-murder. The result to which our inquiry thus far brings us gains additional confirmation from the evidence of the two following most remarkable facts. When in the years 1834—5, twenty-four departments in France had, by way of economy and experiment, very materially reduced the number of those hospitals, the consequence was that the number of infanticides was found *decreased* in thirteen departments; *stationary* in one; and *increased* only in ten, at the same time that the proportion had risen considerably in the other fifty-four departments, where no correspondent reduction of these establishments had taken place—for though the proportion had undergone, during that period, a diminution of 18.5 per cent. in 25 of the latter departments, it had nevertheless increased by 40.5 per cent. in the remaining 29. Our second fact relates to Belgium, where the five provinces which possess Foundling Hospitals exhibited, in the period from the commencement of 1826 to the end of 1829, a proportion of infanticides to the population, in the ratio of 1 to 109,942, while in the other four provinces, where no such institutions exist, the proportion during that period was only 1 to 136,662.

The apprehended increase of infanticides, which the advocates of the Catholic system advance as their principal objection to the plan of the Germans, appears evidently to rest upon

hollow ground in point of experience, and nothing can indeed be more preposterous than the supposition that the thousands of foundlings who are received in the hospitals would, but for this timely means of escape, have suffered a violent death at the hands of their mothers. Even the advocates of the Catholic system themselves, such as Terme and Monfalcon, so far from maintaining that the Protestant countries present more cases of infanticide than the Catholic, appear even to assert that the very reverse is the fact, and that, indeed, more infanticides occur in the latter than in the former. This too ample concession, however, we can scarcely admit, as it is not assuredly fully borne out by the statistical tables. Perhaps we shall be more accurately conveying the real feeling and opinion of our authors, though not exactly so expressed, if we say that the *tendency* to infanticide is greater in Catholic than in Protestant countries, as indeed it may well be when the unnatural disposition has been so long and so systematically fostered.

The increase of desertion or exposure of children by their parents, another evil which the advocates of the Catholic system apprehend may result from the opposite arrangements, cannot be at all better substantiated or, indeed, supported by any facts whatever. Such occurrences, on the contrary, hardly ever take place in Germany, and very rarely in England; and the great noise and excitement it creates whenever a child is discovered to have been deserted in either of these countries plainly show the strangeness of the phenomenon. The example of *Mayence* is another striking refutation of that argument. From the year 1799 to 1811, a period of twelve years, when that place was the centre of the military operations of agitated Europe, and consequently the seat of seduction, debauchery, and moral depravity, only thirty children had been deserted by their parents, while from the 7th of November, 1811, till March 1815, a period of only three years and four months (during which interval a foundling hospital was supported), more than 516 children had been deposited at the institution. Now taking the same average proportion of desertions as that which prevailed before the establishment of the institutions, there would in this period, have been only about eight children forsaken; 508 extra children therefore were thus caused to be deprived of parental care, and to be exposed to all the evil influences, both moral and physical, which necessarily attend such institutions —the remedy being certainly the less preferable than the malady. In taking the above as a fair average proportion, we are probably, moreover, exceeding the truth; for Mayence was then no longer the seat of military operations, and the absence of the majority of the troops much more than compensates for the trifling increase which the standing population would undergo.

This hospital was then suppressed by the Grand Duke of Hesse Darmstadt, and in the *ten* succeeding years only seven cases of desertion took place.

Similar results attended first the foundation and then the abolition of a like institution in Geneva.

Thus, then, statistical inquiries satisfactorily demonstrate that Foundling Hospitals neither diminish the number of infanticides nor prove a check to desertion. Common sense, too, and a little knowledge of human nature, tell us that parents will hardly ever think of deserting their children in countries where government so rigorously enforces their support and education; whereas in countries where the state so readily relieves parents from the real or imaginary cares which children entail, this very facility is the means of stifling in their bosom the last lingering spark of sympathy and anxiety for their progeny. Accustom people ultimately to look forward to the provisions of such institutions as a matter of course and necessity, and the few formalities attendant on a regular application will soon come to be regarded as a sort of inconvenience which might as well be dispensed with by desertion altogether. A watchful police, and a strict magistracy joined to institutions for the relief of only the really destitute, and for the education of their children, must prove a stronger barrier against desertion than the thousands of hospitals which are now in existence throughout the Roman Catholic countries.

Let us now return to our immediate question.

Few facts are better established or more universally admitted than the dreadful extent of mortality in the Foundling Hospitals, despite the various improvements which modern times have effected. The proportion of deaths among the children in the first year amounted in the hospitals at Madrid to sixty-seven per cent.; at Naples the proportion was about the same; at Vienna it reached ninety-two; at Brussels it amounted to fifty-six; at Paris to seventy-two; and in all the other places in France collectively to sixty per cent. Of 19,420 children which had been received in the course of twenty years in the hospitals of Dublin, only 2000 remained alive; at Moscow only 7000 out of 37,600; while at St. Petersburg, out of 25,624 foundlings which had been received from 1832 to 1835 inclusive, 12,290 died in the first year.

Considering that the average mortality of children in their first year, according to the most recent and authentic accounts of Drs. Casper, Quetelet, and others, does not exceed in large towns twenty-five per cent., and in the country and small provincial towns hardly twenty per cent., the enormous mortality in the hospitals appears to be beyond all proportion and parallel, and shows but too plainly the fallacy of the opinion

that the hospitals tend to preserve the lives of the helpless children. The mortality among children fed by the hand is certainly under all circumstances much greater than among those fed naturally from the breast of the mother, but in the hospitals this proportion is far exceeded. The mere removal of a newly-born infant, perhaps, in many cases a distance of several miles,—its exposure to the weather, probably inadequately clothed—the want of a private nurse—and the spread of infectious or contagious diseases among the inmates, may all assist in increasing the mortality. The extraordinary and frightful mortality in the hospital at Vienna occasioned it to be constituted, in 1813, a mere place for the reception of the foundlings till they could be given out to nurses in different parts of the country. By this modification of the system the proportion of deaths had diminished in a few years from one to two, to about one to four or five; yet with all the improvement a mother's nursing and suckling her own child is, unless the mother be herself diseased, the best security for the physical well-doing of the infant.

It is far more difficult to prove by positive numbers that the morals of children are more apt to become corrupted in the hospital than under the parental roof, however humble and wretched. But general reasons, if not contradicted by stubborn facts, may with equal force establish the necessity of a position, and more especially if some confirmatory evidence, albeit slight, can be brought forward in support of that position, as in the case before us. We have in the first instance only to enter fully into the situation of a foundling to see that of all the relations of human life none is less apt to restrain vice and to fortify the will with moral principles than the career to which he is destined and the associations he is compelled to form. If here and there some foundlings are found to flourish in their moral growth, it is in spite of circumstances. They are entrusted from earliest infancy to the care of hired nurses and guardians, who, performing their duties without sympathy for the future welfare of their charge, naturally seize upon every opportunity of reconciling neglect with the prescribed rules of the institution, and of freeing themselves from those higher moral and physical cares which the tender and feeling heart of a parent is alone capable of conceiving and anxious to act upon. If not retained together in one large institution, those with whom the foundling is lodged and boarded are frequently among the least fitted to bring up even their own children as useful members of society;—how much less exertion, then, must we not expect from them in behalf of children whom they keep for the sake of pecuniary emolument alone. They are often the very needy themselves, and in this class the parental affections are too

commonly deadened ; their own offspring would naturally claim their first and best attention, and the stranger child must submit to be worse treated than even those neglected ones, as well to be the object of their jealousy, and often the victim of their young oppression. Nor are there wanting facts to confirm our position. *Parent Duchatelet* in his Researches on Prostitution, has ascertained that most of the female children reared in the foundling hospitals were afterwards found on the *paré* amongst the most common prostitutes ; nor is it less notorious that the gangs of professional thieves and vagrants in France and other Catholic countries contain a great proportion of foundlings. Of 16,878 criminals confined in the central prison of Belgium, 594 belonged to the class of foundlings. Such a result might almost have been foretold, for he who in infancy has never felt the influences of *home*, starts forth into life without the best and most sacred tie that ever by its calm influence tended to keep the feelings on the side of virtue, and without the most powerful check to vicious conduct. These never having formed any family habits, are readily enough led to adopt the same method of bringing up their children which was resorted to for themselves. The children of foundlings are placed in the same position as were their parents, and a despised and vicious race threatens to form itself in the very midst of civilization and improvement, as distinct and separate from the rest of the community as is the colored population from the white denizens of America.

Having thus far refuted the objections to the German system, we shall now more fully point out the evil consequences, both moral and financial, as affecting others than the foundlings themselves, resulting from the Catholic system. These evils have grown to such a magnitude as to have opened at length the eyes of the Catholic public itself to the inexpediency of the system. The moral evils have, however, been greatly exaggerated by the opponents of the hospitals, in like manner as the charge of infanticide has been magnified by the assailants of the plan acted upon in the Protestant communities. It is argued, as we have said, by the advocates of the latter system, that nothing can be more calculated to encourage seduction and concubinage than a system by which the state manages to obviate in a great measure the consequences arising from illicit intercourse, the fear of which might otherwise prove a salutary check upon its indulgence. But what is seemingly true is not therefore necessarily true. A close inspection of the statistical accounts show that the number of illegitimate children in the Catholic countries does not by any means exceed that in the Protestant countries ; and that while the natural children present annually a proportion to the aggregate number

of all the infants born in France as 7.5 to 100, in Portugal as 10 to 100, and in Naples and Sicily as 4.4 to 100, it is in Prussia as 7.4 to 100, in Hanover as 8.4 to 100, in Sweden as 7.4 to 100, in Würtemburg and Saxony as 13 to 100, in the Grand Duchy of Hesse as 17.5 to 100, and in Bavaria as much as 20 to 100. Even in France itself, the departments where most of hospitals (*tours*) are situated are by no means the most abounding in illegitimate births. We do not mean to deny altogether the injurious effects of the hospitals on the morals of a people as regards the intercourse between the sexes; all we wish to intimate is, that there may be far more efficient causes in operation affecting those sexual relations in the nation than the mere existence of foundling hospitals, which at best occupy but a subordinate rank among the causes. The prospect of the cares of a rising family may often prove a bar to marriage, yet passion gets the victory over prudence, and an illegitimate birth is the result. These cases may not seldom put on a different aspect in Catholic countries: the passion is equally gratified, but under the sanction of marriage, and the offspring, instead of being bastardized, is destined to become an inmate of the foundling hospital.

The charge which is levelled against the moral evil arising from the hospitals with regard to family connexions is certainly far better founded. It was always supposed, and the late statistical investigations have but confirmed the fact, that among the foundlings a considerable number of legitimate children was included. According to the calculations made by the Administration of the Parisian hospitals, the average number of legitimate children delivered into those establishments from 1804 to 1833, presented a proportion to all the foundlings collectively as 8 to 100; in 1832, the proportion had even increased to 14 per cent. In Poitiers the average proportion from 1806 to 1836 was 11 to 100; in Parthenay from 1830 to 1835 as 5 to 100; and in two other places as much as 9 and 12 per cent. The parents of most of these legitimate children, as nearly as could be ascertained, were, by all accounts, far from belonging to the destitute class, and yet they never thought of reclaiming them afterwards. If only those who were in distress had deposited their legitimate children, and if all these were reclaimed when the pressure of circumstances rendered their public support no longer necessary, or if, indeed, any considerable proportion was reclaimed, it would almost entirely obviate the objection; but in the whole of France the number of reclaimed foundlings amounted in the years 1824—1833 to only the tenth part of the whole. At Paris, however, the proportion is calculated at only the one hundredth part; and in Belgium it is about a twenty-eighth of the entire number. Now bearing in mind that amongst

those reclaimed were also included *illegitimate* foundlings, the number of legitimate children restored will be seen to amount to almost nothing.

The circumstance that of all the foundlings in France only the hundredth part is of legitimate origin, can by no means justify the existence of the hospitals, as the toleration of a palpable state-disorder cannot be excused by the consideration that it only affects a small portion of the community. The annual levy for military service in Germany is only as 1 to 1500 of the whole population; nevertheless were it not for the especial care taken by the authorities amply to provide for the physical and moral wants of the military, the people would be far from indifferent to the loss of even this small proportion of its members. The fundamental principle on which the Catholic system is based, precludes in the very outset all notion of inquiry into the circumstances which might induce parents to rid themselves of their children, and the evils arising from that system to the innocent inmates of the hospitals—evils to which they would hardly otherwise have been exposed—are sufficient to brand it as fatal and immoral, and the effect of the system upon the parents lends a confirmatory echo to the testimony.

Nor are the evils in a financial point of view of a less grievous character, the number of foundlings having already increased to such an extent that the burden of expenditure must sooner or later, if a proportional increase continue, accumulate so as to render the national resources inadequate to the demand. Indeed, the clamors and complaints of the bulk of the Catholic nations have of late become so loud as to induce governments to propose and attempt some reforms. Such is the actual state of affairs in all the Catholic kingdoms, and more especially in France, where the necessity of a radical reform of the system is especially felt; as is evident from the petitions and resolutions of several of the departmental authorities, and from the prize-essays originated by many of the provincial colleges; those of Bourg, Macon, and Nismes, for example, and by the Society of Benevolent Institutions at Paris.

We shall enter a little more into detail respecting some of the projected reforms, as they furnish us with many important facts by which we may arrive at a due appreciation of the merits and demerits of the system. We gather from the various statements now before us, that the foundlings throughout France, which in 1784 did not exceed 40,000 in number, had increased in 1798 to 51,000; in 1818 to 98,100; and in 1833 to 119,930. The same, if not a still greater ratio of increase is presented by the accounts of some single hospitals. In the hospitals of Paris there were received in 1670 only 312 foundlings; while in 1680 the number had increased to 890; in 1730 to 2,401; in 1790

to 5,700; in 1829 to 7,850; and in 1833 to at least 8,136. In the hospitals at Lyons the number of foundlings in 1700 was not more than 582, while in 1760 it had increased to 863; in 1800 to 1,535; in 1820 to 1,681; and in 1836 to 1,865. In the last two specified cases it will be seen that there was a fluctuation in the ratio, and more especially in the period of the first revolution, when even a diminution is perceptible, owing no doubt to the disordered state of the public institutions generally. From that time, however, the ratio has been uninterruptedly on the increase on such a scale as to render it pretty certain that, without efficient reform, or the intervention of some unforeseen impeding circumstances, the number of foundlings in France twenty-five years hence will be no less than 250,000. That the increase is the exclusive and absolute result of the system itself, and not the effect of some local and national causes, is evident from the example of Belgium, where the average number of foundlings from 1815 to 1822, had likewise steadily increased from 10,953 to 12,700. The advocates of the Catholic system, and more especially *M. Gaillard*, in the first work on our list, object to the arguments drawn from this calculation on the ground of the increased population of France. They are of opinion that the increase of the foundlings is the natural effect of the increase of the population, and that the proportion between the two numbers has rather decreased. The observation, however plausible, is nevertheless inapplicable to the case before us, as we shall immediately show.

At the outbreak of the French Revolution, for instance, the population of France was estimated at twenty-four millions, and in 1833, at thirty-two millions, showing an increase of one fourth of the total number. Adopting now the same standard of ratio for the increase of foundlings, their number, which at the beginning of the revolution was 40,000, ought to have grown in 1833 to no more than 53,000 instead of 120,000, as is actually the case. It is obvious that the causes of the enormous increase must be sought in some other circumstances than in those arising out of the increased population, and, if we do not err, we think we shall be able to trace them to their real sources.

It is but natural to suppose that public institutions, established for the especial purpose of releasing parents from the care of their children, the longer they exist and the further the sphere of their operation extends, the more do they become naturalized to the views and feelings of the nation at large, and the more do the feelings of the people become habituated to the method pursued. The feeling of shame at deserting one's own child loses its acuteness in proportion as the example increases; and the parental anxiety for the well-being of the offspring

diminishes in equal proportion as the improvements effected in the institutions increase the probabilities of health and safety for the infant.

Let us now turn to the heavy expenditure accruing from the system. When foundling hospitals were first introduced into France the expenditure was calculated not to exceed 40,000 francs annually, but it soon greatly surpassed this limit, and compelled the state to levy direct taxes for the special purpose of maintaining the hospitals, the expenses having increased to more than ten millions of francs annually. Of the 97,775,613 francs, the total amount of the expenditure for the maintenance of those hospitals for the years 1824—1833 inclusive, eleven and a half millions were taken from the standing funds of the hospitals themselves; two millions from some special revenue, such as fines, &c., which the state appropriated to that purpose; twenty-one and a half millions were levied from the parishes where the hospitals are situated, and sixty millions from the various departments. The department of Rhone and Lyons had to contribute annually 700,000 francs; while the expenditure of the hospitals at Paris alone exceeds 1,600,000 francs. The expenditure is on the increase despite the lessening of the individual expenses: at Lyons, for instance, in 1826, 83 francs, 46 cents was the sum paid for the board of a foundling, while in 1833 it only cost 66 francs, 87 cents. The same reduction also took place in Paris, where in 1824, the board of a foundling cost as much as 119 francs, 82 cents; while in 1833 it was reduced to 104 francs, 45 cents.

After all it is evident that the evil can only be eradicated with the system itself, and if the state be determined not to bear the heavy burden any longer, it were far better openly to disavow the principle and abandon the system altogether, than to attempt to counteract its effects by a sort of underhand manœuvre. Indeed, it is incomprehensible how clear-sighted men such as Terme and Monfalcon, though they plainly see and complain of the moral and physical evils arising out of the Roman Catholic system, should still approve of the principle; and at the same time propose remedies which evidently give it the lie. We shall, however, leave our French neighbors to themselves, aware that they, of all nations, are the last to bear patiently the burden of heavy taxes merely because they are sanctioned by custom. The French have before them the example of the German States, and more especially the example of England, which latter country, after many fruitless trials, at last determined to give up the system of foundling hospitals altogether: and it does not appear to fare the worse for it.

Even Catholic Russia, which generally models her institutions after those of the French, has not suffered the establish-

ment of new hospitals in its two capitals since 1808. And we may venture, in conclusion, to predict that though vanity may prevent the French from acknowledging in plain words that the Germanic nations have at all times evinced more tact and sounder judgment in their views on social relations, they will ere long contrive to discover in the question at issue, as they have done on many other occasions, if not a new form, at least an *original name* for their conversion to the German system, without avowing, at the same time, the fallacy of their existing one.

Art. VI. 1. *Dissertations on Unaccomplished Prophecy.* By WILLIAM SNELL CHAUNCY.

2. *The Second Advent of Christ the blessed Hope of the Church.* By W. URWICK, D.D.

3. *The Personal Reign of Christ.* By ORLANDO T. DOBBIN, A.B., Trinity College, Dublin.

4. *The Millennium a Spiritual State, not a Personal Reign.* By JOHN JEFFERSON.

5. *An Elucidation of the Prophecies, being an Exposition of the Books of Daniel and the Revelation, &c.* By JOSEPH TYSO.

6. *Millenarianism Unscriptural; or a Glance at some of the Consequences of that Theory.*

7. *The Question, Will Christ's Reign during the Millennium be Personal? answered from Scripture.* By CHARLES MORRISON, Belfast.

8. *Israel's Return; or Palestine Regained.* By JOSEPH ELISHA FREEMAN.

THE prophecies of Scripture, notwithstanding all the unprofitable speculation and the unchristian tempers with which they have been perplexed and dishonored, still maintain their prominence as subjects of inquiry; and many who have been accused of regarding them with too much carelessness and neglect, are coming forward to prove that the charge was groundless, and that though they did not obtrude their views unduly in their public instructions from the pulpit, nor throw themselves with indecent haste into the arena of controversy, yet that they were not unmindful of the importance of studying the whole scheme of prophecy, and forming a decided judgment on the questions which have so long vexed and divided the Christian church.

We have no doubt that from hence a considerable amount of good has arisen, and that the fanatical extravagancies which

have accompanied it, will wear themselves out, or soon retire from the sight of sober and sacred elucidation.

The students of prophecy who pursue their inquiries with a devout and diffident spirit, have long been aware that their chief difficulties lie, not in the grand outline, but in the detail. It is to this that the very judicious comment of Sir Isaac Newton on the words of Daniel may most appropriately be applied. The vision is 'sealed unto the time of the end ;' and before that time, if not altogether clothed in obscurity, it will be susceptible of only a very partial and imperfect interpretation. Yet ought not this to deter those who are qualified for the task from using diligently all legitimate means for obtaining clear and satisfactory views as far as they advance, and to leave what is now inexplicable to the development of time. The prophecies stand not as anomalies in the moral and spiritual world ; they are in this respect on a footing with many other mysteries which it is known and confessed will never be fully explained or understood ; but of which it has never been said that the time, and pains, and learning devoted to them have been thrown away. Who, indeed, would even dare to insinuate that this is the case ? Who will say that the laborious volumes which have been written on predestination, free will, the origin of evil, the incarnation, and the doctrine of the Trinity, have been utterly futile ? Certainly the main body of the difficulty has not been removed ; and to persons unaccustomed to reasoning, and indisposed to research, little benefit may accrue ; for the case is not similar to that of an invention or discovery, in which the public may at their ease, without care or trouble, reap the advantages which the silent, and patient, and laborious researches of the learned may have procured for them. On the contrary, it is a case in which each individual must labor for himself ; and whatever advantages he would derive, he must gain by his own exertions. That which lies before him is a process of abstract reasoning, and he must travel through it for himself, or he will not be able to appreciate the conclusion to which it leads ; the utmost reach of extraneous assistance is to point out to him the steps by which he may proceed in order at last to arrive at the conclusion. It is, therefore, only to those who have themselves gone through the requisite process on subjects such as we have alluded to, that a true appeal can be made as to the value of the studies, or of the works that have been written on them ; but surely there will be none of these who will think that they have gained nothing, and who will not declare, that though some obscurity may still remain, yet that a general light has been thrown on the whole question—that the apparent contradictions and inconsistencies which seemed to attach to it, have in great measure vanished—and, in fine, they

will be conscious that they do know more, and understand more than before they attempted the investigation. And thus it is with regard to the prophecies. The best commentaries and expositions have confessedly failed in giving sufficient and satisfactory explanations, and others seem only to have rendered 'darkness visible'; but yet, to the sober minded student, there has resulted a sort of general illumination; he feels that he knows more of the grand scheme of providence, of the fundamental principles and system of divine government, and that he can trace some of its footsteps more accurately.

But it is only by the cautious and sober-minded student that such benefits may be reaped. Piety is, indeed, indispensable; without it no intellectual capacity, no aptitude for scientific, philosophical, or critical research can be accepted as alone sufficient for an exposition of the mysteries of prophecy. But piety associated with a radical defect of judgment—piety in alliance with a heated imagination—piety which regards itself as an object of divine favoritism rather than as the product of divine grace operating by scriptural influence instead of miraculous inspiration—piety enthralled by such conditions we regard as a total disqualification for this, or indeed any other study involving the character of religion and the final interests of the church of God.

To persons who in any remarkable degree fall under this category the language of prophecy acts as a kind of *ignis fatuus*, and misleads by its deceitful and fatal facility of application. Whether with respect to past or passing events, they are betrayed into the most strange and dangerous delusions. Indeed, from whatever cause, most of the writers who have undertaken to publish commentaries on the prophecies have more or less furnished an illustration of this unfortunate fact. The sacred words seem to have been tortured into every form that human ingenuity could devise or human perversity desire; and thus they have been made to countenance not only crude and wild speculations, but sometimes the practical bearing of these speculations has threatened the very constitution and framework of civil society. So early as the first ages of Christianity did something of this kind take place, and to such an extent did it soon proceed, that the *Apocalypse* itself fell into disrepute; and the same spirit—though we must own in some of its less virulent forms—has descended to our times. Without, however, further enlarging in our description of such erroneous interpretations, as each has its precise cause from whence it has arisen, by pointing out these we may guard the future inquirer against their ensnaring influence, however temptingly they may lie in his way.

The first and most fundamental rule for all expositors, and

especially for expositors of prophecy, is a genuine and correct system of verbal criticism, sedulously avoiding whatever may appear false and flimsy. In order to proceed with the best founded hopes of success, the true reading of a passage ought to be sought for diligently, by comparing the best editions ; and if possible, manuscripts of the sacred oracles. When the reading has been decided on, there must follow the genuine meaning of the terms ; and particularly when there is a shadow of doubt concerning them, it should be gathered by carefully comparing the various passages in which they occur, whether in sacred or profane writers, instead of simply trusting to the authority of lexicographers, as is too often the case. Next comes the grammatical sense of the whole sentence, which should be well and thoroughly weighed before it is incorporated with the rest of the prophecy, and much more before any attempt is made to decipher and apply it. How little this has been attended to by the advocates of the modern millennium scheme their absurd interpretations too plainly show ;—by neglecting this canon of all fair exposition they have placed among the unaccomplished prophecies some that have undoubtedly been fulfilled, and introduced much vagueness and unnecessary difficulties among others whose meaning and application seem far from doubtful. Mr. Jefferson has assumed, that there is not a single passage which speaks of the personal and protracted reign of Christ upon earth in plain and unequivocal terms ; and he shows that one of the passages on which the millenarians lay great stress conveys no such idea. ‘The coming’ of Christ to destroy ‘the ‘man of sin,’ he affirms, does not warrant their interpretation of it. Availing himself of the rule we have laid down, he remarks,

‘It is very common in the Scriptures to speak of any remarkable visitation of divine mercy or justice as ‘the coming of the Lord,’ when it is sufficiently obvious that nothing personal is intended. A few passages only can be cited ; ‘He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass’ (Ps. lxxii. 6). ‘Bow thy heavens, O Lord, and come down’ (Ps. cxliv. 5). ‘Behold, the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt’ (Isaiah xix. 1). ‘The Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity. His going forth is prepared as the morning, and he shall come unto us as the rain,’ &c. (Hosea vi. 3). ‘Behold the Lord cometh out of his place, and will come down and tread upon the high places of the earth’ (Micah i. 3). If you will be at the pains to look at these verses in their several connexions, you will see at once that nothing personal is meant. In like manner when the Saviour spake of *coming* to establish his gospel kingdom, it is evident that he intended nothing personal ; ‘Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom’

(Matt. xvi. 28). This prophecy was literally fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, when the Son of Man was revealed in the plenitude and power of his saving grace and miraculous agency. So also when he speaks of his coming to destroy Jerusalem : 'For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west ; so shall the coming of the Son of Man be. For wheresoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together' (Matt. xxiv. 27, 28). The reference plainly is to the siege of the city by the Roman armies ; and the 'coming of the Son of Man' was the infliction of his judgment in its destruction. When a similar phraseology then is employed respecting his interposition to destroy popery, it cannot with any propriety be concluded that it *must* be personally intended. The evidence of holy Scripture is on the other side, and forbids us to entertain the thought of a personal coming, unless some text were adduced which unequivocally asserted it. The one to which so much importance is here attached, is itself a refutation of the personal scheme ; 'Then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom *the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth*, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming' (2 Thess. ii. 8). Is not the last clause fairly explained by the preceding one ? Besides, the temporal power of popery is already destroyed ; its spiritual power is that of error, which truth will overcome ; and even this is vastly inferior now to what it was when Luther came forth single-handed to attack it by truth alone. And further, the coming of the Saviour to destroy antichrist, is plainly distinguished in this very connexion from his coming to judge the world. For the first object he is described as 'riding on a white horse, and clothed with a vesture dipped in blood,' but for the latter, as 'seated on a great white throne, and from his face the earth and the heavens flee away.' The former is placed before the millennium, the latter after it. The effects of the former coming are the destruction of his enemies by the word of his mouth, the binding of Satan, and the revival and prevalence of true religion for a thousand years ; but the effects of the latter coming are the resurrection and judgment of all the dead, the renovation of the mundane system, and the introduction of the final state.'—pp. 47—49.

The next thing after the grammatical meaning and the approved reading and genuine scope of a prophecy have been established, is to distinguish between the literal and the symbolical, and to affix to the latter in all cases, upon scriptural principles, its right application. We grieve to say that Mr. Chauncy, and writers from whom he has derived many of the illustrations of his views, give themselves little trouble to discriminate in this matter ; whatever best squares and harmonizes with their scheme they adopt, and make the literal and symbolical change places in a most whimsical and arbitrary manner when a pre-millennial advent, the restoration of Israel and the establishment of Judaism in Palestine, are the affirmatives to be maintained. While authors of this stamp thus use the language of

prophecy, and apply its symbols as if they were but mere familiar 'household words,' and their meaning as evident as the terms of ordinary discourse, others have rightly made them a chief object of study,—have sorted, arranged, and established specific rules of interpreting them, and in many cases, we are bound to say, with evident success. Among these the palm is undoubtedly due to Mr. Faber; we refer to his admirable chapter on the figures and symbols of the prophecies. The system of hieroglyphics which is the principal medium of prophetic revelation has its origin in nature and history, and it is only from the darkness of the human mind, and the scantiness of words, that the clue has in any measure been lost. It speaks by pictures rather than by sounds; and through the medium of those pictures, rather than through the medium of labored verbal definition, it sets forth with equal ease and precision, the nature of the matters predicted. The only difficulty is to find the key to the symbols: this, with regard to 'scriptural hieroglyphics, is 'furnished by Scripture itself; and when the import of each 'hieroglyphic is thus ascertained, there is little difficulty in 'translating (as it were) an hieroglyphical prophecy into the 'unfigured phraseology of modern language.' Mr. Faber's grand division of the prophetic symbols is into two classes, one of which contains such symbols as represent abstract ideas, and are purely metaphorical or allegorical; and the other such as represent the natural or spiritual world, or objects or events in the natural or spiritual world. These two classes he shows to contain divisions, and the divisions again subdivisions; and thus after judicious parting and arranging the obscurity and uncertainty which at first appears to involve the prophetic symbols is with little further difficulty, in some good measure at least, dissipated and explained. We fear, however, that much will remain inexplicable to modern expositors, as the complete knowledge of the Hebrew system of hieroglyphics seems to have been confined to the Hebrew schools of the prophets.

Not less important than a right understanding of the import of the symbols, is *consistent interpretation*. Literal must not be confused with figurative signification. Mr. Chauncy supplies various instances of this strange amalgamation. A striking one, in support of his notions of the personal reign of Christ upon earth during the millennium, is his taking in its literal sense the fourth verse in the fourteenth chapter of Zechariah, where it is said that in that day the feet of the Messiah 'shall stand upon 'the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem, on the east; 'and that the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof 'toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a 'very great valley,' &c.; and also the sixteenth verse, that it

'shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which come against Jerusalem, shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles.' But the 'living waters,' in the eighth verse, he understands as *figuratively* signifying the diffusion of Christian knowledge and the various other blessings which the world at large are to enjoy as the fruits of the Redeemer's reign. Now, it is unfair and contrary to all just exegetical principles, that two parts of one description, which is apparently homogeneous, and which we apprehend cannot be shown to be otherwise, should be thus discordantly interpreted. It ought undoubtedly to be wholly literal or wholly figurative; and whether one or the other, let common sense and the analogy of Scripture decide. If it be taken literally, it involves the literal restoration of the Jewish temple and worship; but if the New Testament assures us these are finally abolished, of course the true interpretation cannot be a literal one, and it is necessary, therefore, to admit that it must be taken figuratively. Consequently, too, the whole, and not merely a part or parts must be considered figurative. On the absurdity of founding a Jewish polity which shall literally answer the description of the prophet, and which all nations on the face of the earth shall recognize by going up year by year continually to keep the feast of the tabernacles, Dr. Urwick remarks:

'One feels as if persons who could seriously hold such views had so far merged judgment, that reasoning would scarcely tell upon them, or we should be disposed to ask how was Jerusalem to contain them all? And though that may be answered by explaining that they are to go up, not *en masse*, but by their representatives, yet allowing this, if the feast is to last but seven days, as formerly, how will matters be so arranged that the deputies from all parts are to arrive at the exact time for the solemnity? And, further, if it be said that absences occasioned by accidents or other unavoidable delays on the road or passage, will not be visited with the judgments threatened, 'the *will* being taken for the *deed*,' I here demand under what *view*, and for what *intent*, all the *Gentile* nations are to keep this *Jewish* festival? The observance of the solemnity, according to the Mosaic order, was to be confined to persons who were 'Israelites born,' and it was to be observed by them in commemoration of their forefathers dwelling in booths when God brought them out of the land of Egypt; but such an occurrence never took place in the history of the Chinese, or the Russians, or the Tahitians, or any other people; so that still the question returns—What answer will Gentile parents then give to the inquiry which their children will naturally propose when they see all the preparations making for the journey, 'WHAT MEAN ye by this service?' But I refrain from commenting longer on these expositions. To believe that these things *can be*, requires very strong faith. To

believe that they are taught as verities in the book of God certainly exceeds the capacity of my faith.'—Section iii., p. 81.

Dr. Urwick's views throughout are regulated by the just principle we have laid down, and in this he is followed by Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Dobbin. Instead of literalizing the hieroglyphics, and converting symbols into the objects they only darkly shadow forth, they are only intent upon discovering the fair and legitimate application of each, either as it stands alone, having no parallel, or as it harmonizes with the general strain of the prophetic writings to which it may have an immediate or remote relation. Thus Mr. Jefferson happily exposes the absurdity of the mode of interpretation adopted by the advocates of the premillennial advent and the personal reign of a thousand years. The passage he selects is the celebrated vision in the twentieth chapter of the Revelation, the first six verses. In proof that the literal interpretation of this text cannot be sustained, Mr. Jefferson states, among others, the following reasons.

'It is unfair to attempt such interpretation. The passage is one of a series of prophetic visions, which are all couched in figurative language, and are interpreted accordingly. 'Did the words occur,' as Dr. Wardlaw remarks, 'in an historical or epistolary composition, it would justly be pronounced unnatural (unless we were specially warned of the writer's deviation from his usual style), to explain them symbolically. Now in a professedly symbolical book, there is the very same force of objection against their being interpreted *literally*.' A literal interpretation of the entire passage is not attempted; indeed, is impossible. It follows an interesting and sublime description of the glorious triumphs of Christ in his spiritual kingdom, and of the destruction of the papal antichrist, a literal exposition of which is too absurd to be attempted by any man of sound mind. Who, for example, ever imagined that Christ has literally 'a sword proceeding out of his mouth,' or that he wears in heaven 'a vesture dipped in blood?' The connexion of this passage with that which precedes it, is such as to show the close consecutiveness both of the revelations, and of the facts revealed. There is no mark of transition, nor any change of style. So obvious, indeed, is this, that so far as I am aware, no attempt is made to render literally the former part of the text; 'the dragon, the binding with a chain, and the sealing,' are allowed by all to be symbolical. 'Why then are we immediately to make a transition from the symbolical to the literal; from the style of prophecy to the style of history?' or why must we blend the two modes in interpreting the same passage? But even where the literal interpretation is attempted, it fails at the very point where it is most important that it should hold; and instead of *living souls* of martyrs reigning with Christ, it gives us '*risen and glorified bodies*.'—pp. 10, 11.

The misapplying of particular prophecies is another source of confusion among the expositors of this obscure department of revelation. Such, for instance, as those against many of the nations of antiquity. 'It is true that there is a moral analogy 'in the dispensations of providence, and by consequence, the 'divine judgments, in ancient times, may be rightly held forth 'as a beacon and warning to our own. The practical lesson to 'be deduced is, that if God spared not the sinful nations of 'antiquity, it behoves us to beware lest he spare not us. Ne- 'vertheless this is not the primary sense of the denunciations 'against the Ammonites, the Moabites, &c.; and they must not 'be primarily applied to the modern nations of Europe.' To these latter they can only refer in a secondary or accommodated sense. Strictly speaking, the denunciations have been long ago fulfilled; the nations against whom they were prophesied have long since received their punishment, have sunk into insignificance, and have disappeared from the face of the earth. Those precise threatenings will never again be executed; not even will the mystical antitype of the Chaldean Babylon suffer the very woes announced against her precursor. In short, except by way of general analogy, nothing of all this belongs either to our own or to future times.

On our Lord's awfully magnificent and terrible predictions of the destruction of Jerusalem, which some have explained as having a twofold application—referring ultimately if not chiefly to the day of judgment, Dr. Urwick ventures the following suggestion. It has at least the merit of being ingenious and probable.

'Many attempts have been made to anatomise this prophecy, and exhibit separately the parts which relate to the invasion of Judea and desolation of Jerusalem by Titus, and the parts which regard the judgment of the world at the last day. I have not met with any thing satisfactory in this way. If any man could have done it well, Bishop Horsley was the man; he had learning, ingenuity, power, and determination enough for it. Yet one cannot read the sermon in which he attempts to separate the prophecy of the 'coming' from the prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, without feeling that a giant is grappling with a difficulty he cannot master. The statement of our Lord, 'Verily, I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled,' puts it, I think, beyond question, that the whole range of the prediction was to have an accomplishment before the then present age of human beings should all have died from the face of the earth.

'I venture to suggest whether the destruction of Jerusalem, with the various circumstances detailed as connected with it, was not inquired after by the disciples, and foretold by our Saviour as a 'SIGN' or 'type' of his second advent, and of the final judgment? I believe

the word 'sign' is commonly taken as meaning a 'token' or 'proof'; but from the use of the word in the gospels, I think it rather intends a 'type,' or a thing which corresponds with another, and which may be taken as an illustration of it upon a small or inferior scale. 'Then certain of the Scribes and of the Pharisees answered, saying, Master, we would see a **sign** from thee. But he answered and said unto them, an evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a **sign**; and there shall no **sign** be given to it, but the **sign** of the prophet Jonas: for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.'—Matt. xii. 38—40. On another occasion the Jews demanded of him, 'What **sign** shonest thou then, that we may see, and believe thee? what dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat'—as though the daily supply of manna to the Israelites were a *type* or *sign* to the Israelites of the doctrine which he promulgated to them. Our Lord in reply to their request for a 'sign,' at once referred to himself as the glorious reality of which the manna Moses gave to the Israelites was properly the type or 'sign.' See John vi. 30, &c. Every reader will recollect that the prophets often, when delivering divine messages to the people, accompanied them with symbolic actions, and these symbolic actions were signs. I give but one example from many. 'Thou also, son of man, take thee a tile, and lay it before thee, and pourtray upon it the city, even Jerusalem. And lay siege against it, and build a fort against it, and cast a mount against it; set the camp also against it, and set battering rams against it round about. Moreover take thou unto thee an iron pan, and set it for a wall of iron between thee and the city: and set thy face against it, and it shall be besieged, and thou shalt lay siege against it. This shall be a **sign** to the house of Israel.'—Ezekiel iv. 1—3.

'If the idea now thrown out be correct, it at once settles the question as to the twofold reference of the prophecy which this note regards, and shows that instead of portioning it out, so that some statements of it should be made to foretell events that occurred within fifty years after it was delivered, while other statements of it regard events that have not yet transpired, the *whole* of it is the *prophecy* of a **sign**—a 'sign' upon a scale of unequalled grandeur, and typifying a *reality* of incomparably greater magnitude and moment still—a 'prophecy of a sign,' which being fulfilled, will involve both the *pattern* and the *pledge* of the ultimate reality signified. Consequently the *whole* of it had a fulfilment in, and shortly previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the *whole* of it is to have *another* fulfilment at the second coming of the Lord.'—pp. 5, 6, Note.

But perhaps the most prolific source of all errors on prophetic subjects, has been the bending and coloring historical events, in order to make them fit a particular prophecy, or tally with a particular hypothesis; a presumptuous and perilous undertaking, adopted by a great number of expositors, all differing from one another with regard to the application of the same

prediction. Witness for example, the enumeration of the ten kingdoms into which the Roman empire was to be divided. In the vision of the ten horned beast, the commentators saw that they were bound to find ten kingdoms, three of which were to fall before an eleventh. Accordingly, there are perhaps a dozen lists of such kingdoms, and each list precisely tallies with the conditions of the prophecy, yet all are dissimilar and discordant. Certainly nothing of this kind could have happened had not the commentators intentionally, or unintentionally fitted the event to the prediction, instead of simply selecting an event which would actually and of itself correspond. Before an interpreter can be qualified to read history by the light of prophecy, and apply prophecy again to the facts of history, he must be able to ascertain the precise relative importance, and the real definite character, moral and political, of every event that has taken place upon the great theatre of the world during the lapse of its six thousand years. And who is equal to a task like this; where are the histories to be found? How many kings and kingdoms may have passed away without a record; and of those of whom there is still some memorial, how opposite are the accounts given by different historians, and how difficult, nay, often how impossible it is to determine which is the true one? Historians who agree as to the main facts in substance, yet trace them to such contrary sources, ascribe them to such contrary motives, invest them with such different degrees of importance, give them such an opposite moral character, that it would seem we must be utterly at fault when we are required to show their reference to a prophecy, which describes events only by their real importance and their true moral character.

If on some occasions prophecies have been tortured for the purpose of this spurious and dangerous application, the very doubtfulness and indistinctness of history has more frequently rendered the process unnecessary. The interpreter takes upon himself the character of historian, as well as commentator. That is, he arranges the facts according to an order of his own—supplies deficiencies from his imagination assisted by doubtful circumstances, and obliterates what he may deem superfluous and not exactly suited to his purpose. But even where there is sufficient vigour of mind and of principle to resist the temptation of thus tampering with history as we find it, to the wisest and most discreet it often proves uncertain and dangerous ground. We do not mean to affirm that with regard to the grand outline of prophecy, and the scheme of providence, history is not to be consulted. Imperfect as it is in everything truly important and which links prophecy and providence together, we have no other guide. Pagan historians and even the infidel historian Gibbon, furnish almost the whole body of facts

which are applied to the elucidation of the prophecies; and we have no doubt whatever, that were an historian, with different general views and principles, to travel over the ground which Gibbon has occupied, the prophecies which relate to the latter ages would be much farther elucidated, and there would be infinitely less reason to complain, that although the prophetical descriptions are in themselves definite and accurate if fully understood, and the events of history possess an equally definite character if properly appreciated; yet, from the ignorant and imperfect data of commentators, are often wrongfully associated and misapplied. In fine, and as a practical corollary to all that has been advanced on this head, when we meet with these misstatements and misconceptions, let it be remembered how much an habitually pious state of mind, a disposition to view and estimate all events with reference to the glory of God and the advancement of his kingdom, will tend to give clear and right notions of the interpretation of prophecy. In proportion, as this is the case, we view the prophecies, as also the whole of the word of God, under the same aspect, according to the same rules, from the same eminence, with the same associations as did the sacred writers themselves; and in like proportion too, may it be hoped, that our judgments respecting them will be analogous. Earthly cares and feelings dim the perceptions, and mislead the understanding; and perhaps we may add that possibly the chief reason why the prophecies are said to be 'sealed to the 'time of the end,' is that until the kingdoms, and parties, and learning, and pride, and interests of this world shall have passed away, the scales will not fall from the eyes of men, to enable them to see clearly the mysteries of providence and grace.

Another particular in relation to our present subject, which is so obvious that it would appear superfluous to notice, had not the neglect of it led to very serious practical errors, is a rule which, with regard to scriptural interpretation in general, no man in his senses thinks of violating—namely, that isolated texts and obscure paragraphs must not be so explained as in any way to contradict the general tenor of scripture in the established rules of Christian faith and practice. One part of holy writ cannot stand in opposition to another; and while there is a positive precept to the contrary, or where the spirit of Christianity leads in a contrary direction, no exposition of an obscure prophecy must be placed in competition. Thus for instance, the command of our Saviour to 'go and teach all nations, and to preach the gospel to every creature,' is absolute; and when we meet with the interpretation of prophecy, which assumes that the evangelization of the world will be accomplished by a miraculous effusion of the Holy Spirit, which is calculated to supersede human agency and missionary labours,

we may be sure that the interpretation is erroneous, and however plausible its appearance, we must confidently reject it. The same may be said of interpretations which have been put forth of late, and which make the test of Christian conduct to consist in studying certain parts of the Holy Scriptures, and of Christian faith in holding certain peculiar views of futurity. All such interpretations are *a priori* suspicious, and upon examination cannot fail to prove false.

One other principle, and it is the last we shall notice, as the abuse of it has been fraught with many wrong notions of truth, and a thousand delusions, is that which requires of every expositor of the prophetic scriptures yet unfulfilled, a sacred regard to the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom, and its progressive advancement to its final consummation unamalgamated with the politics of earth, and conferring as its highest rewards the glory and felicities of heaven. The modern millenarian, whether he be found among the clergy of a worldly sanctuary, where the beggarly elements of earth are continually mixed up with things sacred to form an imposing hierarchy, or whether he be a convert from Judaism, his imagination filled with the splendors of his national glory which has so long passed away, and which he yet hopes to see restored; one familiar with a visible head to his church, and the other expecting to behold in the seed of David, a successor to fill his throne in Palestine; both agree that the millennium, instead of a spiritual state, is to be a personal reign of Christ in this world,—upon this earth for a thousand years; and the martyrs and eminent saints are to be raised from the dead, and to share with him the cares and honours of regal government. How opposed this is to a fair and reasonable exposition of the prophecies relating to this period—how contrary to the genius and spirit of Christianity—and more especially to its spiritual and heavenly tendencies—three of the writers at the head of this article have abundantly shown. Mr. Dobbin, we have not quoted, and perhaps his style is a little too scholastic, ornate, and pretending, but his argument is well sustained; and in referring to this branch of the prophetical question, he pursues it in a strain of Christian eloquence. We can only afford space for the concluding paragraph.

‘But over and beyond this, I might object to the moral influence this doctrine exercises upon the mind of the believer of it. Does it not, I ask him, usurp the place of heaven in his affections? What is it the millenarian preacher expatiates upon—is it not the future felicity of *earth*? What do his hearers converse upon when they meet together—is it not the felicity of *earth*? What is the subject of their thoughts by day, what of their dreams by night, what of their prayers in the closet, family, and church—is it not the felicity of *earth*? The millenarian dwells upon it, as I know by per-

sonal intercourse with many of the most devout who bear that name, to the exclusion of almost every other scriptural subject, except as connected with it: and it grows to such inordinate dimensions before his enraptured fancy, that 'the proportion of faith,' (Rom. xii. 6) is by him quite forgotten. This hope sustains him in trial, comforts in sorrow, impels to duty, and in fact takes the place with him of the multifarious mass of doctrine, impulse, and motive, which urges the plain bible Christian upon his heavenward way. Knowing in short, how much this is the case—how intrusive this doctrine of a personal reign with all its adjuncts of temporal glory to the believer is—how it jostles other doctrines out of their place in the evangelical scheme—and how it entrenches itself in the mind of its votaries at the expense of other valuable truths, (unintentionally it may be—through the infirmity of nature it may be,) I can sometimes account for it, only by supposing that those who take this view, have forgotten the admonition of the book of God,—'if ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are *above*, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God. Set your affections on *things above, not on things on the earth.*' (Col. iii. 1, 2.) As far as their practice goes, this precept is of no avail: for they deem it a merit rather than a fault, to give it a virtual abrogation, and look with longing for a time, when earth and earth's fulness, its bounds and its blessings, shall be theirs. Because then they substitute earth for heaven in their scheme of retribution to the saints,—a partial for a perfect happiness; and because they exalt this doctrine to an unseemly importance in their published schemes of divine truth, as well as in their conversation and life; and heaven our eternal home, heaven our unfading glory, heaven our changeless inheritance, heaven our unpurchaseable portion, heaven our endless peace, heaven our untroubled rest, heaven our deathless bliss, is made a thing of small account, secondary, subordinate—we reject the theory of a personal reign.'—pp. 35—37.

Of Mr. Chauncy's work we are compelled to say, that it violates every one of the critical canons we have assumed as indispensable rules to guide the enquirer in his way through the mazes of unaccomplished prophecy. Dr. Urwick's lectures we unfeignedly commend to the Christian church, as a valuable addition to its sacred literature and fervid eloquence. The following admonitory passage from the third discourse is worthy of serious attention.

'At present the science of prophetic interpretation is so little matured, the exact point where we ourselves stand in the prophetic range, is involved in so much perplexity, the expositions that have been given of predictions, the fulfilment of which has not been undeniably fixed by inspiration, are so varied, so incongruous, and many of them so extravagant and wild, that one is tempted to think whether the wiser and safer plan may not be to wait, patient in ignorance, and

leave the event itself to explain the prophecy. Let me add also, that in my view there are comparatively few minds that are prepared by enlarged and well adjusted information, and by habits of cool, vigorous, deep, comprehensive and nicely discriminating thought, for successfully pursuing this line of Christian inquiry. And it is truly pitiable, not to use a stronger term, to witness the excited temperament, the confident loquacity, the reckless impetuosity of the imaginative faculty, the utter destitution of anything like an approach to self-distrust, and the eagerness with which the flimsiest plausibilities are seized upon, as indisputable verities, that often force themselves upon our notice in persons who claim credit for high attainments in prophetic research.'

—*The Second Advent of Christ*, p. 76.

Mr. Tysos work does not take so wide a range as some of the others;—his precise object is to show ‘that the seventy ‘weeks, the one thousand two hundred and sixty days, and the ‘events predicted under the seven trumpets and seven vials, ‘have not yet taken place, but that they will be accomplished ‘within the space of about three years and a half from their ‘commencement, and probably at no very distant period.’ The work contains a great deal of extravagance, some curious matter for still further investigation—especially on the discrepancies between the various writers on unfulfilled prophecy with regard to the prophetical periods. For the most part, however, we may affirm of Mr. Tysos volume, that its interpretations are arbitrary and its reasonings fallacious.

Israel’s Return, or Palestine Regained, is chiefly attractive for its title; it is a thrice told repetition of what has been said by other writers on the same side of the question. Our readers will form some conjecture of the nature of the work when we state that the heading of the tenth chapter runs thus: ‘Personal appearing of Messiah in behalf of Israel—tremendous ‘slaughter of their enemies—conversion of Israel to Christ as ‘their Messiah—and further restoration of them to their own ‘land.’ The author’s ‘unbounded confidence,’ his infinite superiority to ‘doubt, diffidence, and uncertainty’ on subjects which most thoughtful men approach with awe and apprehension, lest they should be deceived themselves, and thus mislead others, may recommend him to a certain portion of ‘the Christian public’—for whose meridian, indeed, his book seems chiefly to be written—but in our minds confidence, when not based on argument, ‘unbounded’ though it be, awakens proportionate distrust. ‘Israel’s Return’ goes the whole length of the premillennial theory. If Christianity were not a spiritual system, and Christ was not the ‘Prince of Peace,’ we might study these millenarian productions with the feelings with which we trace the bloody track of heroes whose mission is the destruction of the human race, and still retain the consis-

tency of our Christian character. But we confess that the greater our familiarity with these writers becomes, the deeper is our conviction of their estrangement from the true spirit and grand design of the Christian dispensation. As an antidote to the manifold errors involved in the modern millenarian scheme, and as a work admirably adapted to aid the sincere inquirer, whom this scheme may have a little perplexed, and whose views it may have unsettled, we recommend the perusal of 'Millenarianism Unscriptural; or a Glance at some 'of the Consequences of that Theory.' What these consequences are in their general character, the author well describes in his preface—and each particular feature is drawn with a masterly hand in the work itself. '*Consequences* of incongruous, 'anomalous, prodigious, and even of a terrific character—*consequences* incompatible with the nature and design both of 'Judaism and Christianity—*consequences*, in particular, seriously 'infringing, if not subversive of the mediatorial economy—'consequences repugnant to the explicit testimony of Scripture, as 'to the resurrection and judgment of the human race; the ultimate abode of the righteous, and the final doom of the world—'consequences, in short, irreconcileable with express declarations of our Lord himself.'

Mr. Morrison's 'Question, Will Christ's Reign during the 'Millennium be Personal?' is very ably answered, and all the points at issue in this controversy satisfactorily discussed. Both parties would do well to read it.

Art. VII. *The Life, Journals, and Correspondence of Samuel Pepys, Esq., F.R.S., Secretary to the Admiralty in the Reigns of Charles II. and James II.; including a Narrative of his Voyage to Tangier, deciphered from the Short-hand MSS. in the Bodleian Library.* By the Rev. JOHN SMITH, A.M., Decipherer of 'Pepys's Memoirs.' Now first published from the Originals. In two vols. London: Bentley. 1841.

THESE volumes will be welcomed by a large class of readers who have derived both entertainment and information from the Diary and Letters which were published a few years since under the editorship of Lord Braybrooke. They constitute an appropriate supplement to the larger work of his lordship, by the side of which they will naturally take their place in all our historical libraries. Samuel Pepys was born February 23rd, 1632, and passed his boyhood in or near London. He was

educated at St. Paul's school, whence he removed to Cambridge in 1651. He married early, and was involved for some time in considerable pecuniary straits. Fortunately for Pepys, he had a powerful friend in his cousin Sir Edward Montagu, afterwards created Earl of Sandwich, into whose house he was received, and who paved the way for his subsequent advancement. During the brief protectorate of Richard he embarked in the Naseby, to accompany Sir Edward, then 'one of his 'Highness the Lord Protector's council, Lord Commissioner of 'the Treasury, and general at sea,' on an expedition to the Sound. On returning to England he obtained a public employment under Sir George Downing, whom Anthony Wood justly describes as 'a sider with all times and changes.' The political principles both of Pepys and of his cousin were of that convenient order which admitted of seasonable change. Prior to the restoration they were anti-monarchical, and Pepys especially, as would seem from the following entry in his diary, was somewhat violent in his round-head propensities. 'Here dined 'with us two or three country gentlemen; among the rest Mr. 'Christmas, my old schoolfellow, with whom I had much talk. 'He did remember that I was a great round-head when I was 'a boy, and I was much afraid that he would have remembered 'the words that I said the day the king was beheaded (that, 'were I to preach upon him, my text should be—'The memory 'of the wicked shall rot'); but I found afterwards that he did 'go away school before that time.' Reading accurately the signs of the times, Montague hastened to make terms with the exiled prince, and his dependent relative was not a whit behind him in discarding, *sans ceremonie*, the republican tendencies of his youth. Both obtained their reward,—the former being created Earl of Sandwich, and the latter being appointed Clerk of the Acts. From this period to the revolution, Pepys continued, with a brief interruption which we shall notice presently, to occupy influential and lucrative posts. His official duties were discharged with industry and skill, and with a larger measure of integrity than was common to the politicians of his day. His diary, which was published by Lord Braybrooke in 1825, is unquestionably the most interesting and important of his productions yet given to the public. The letters and journals in the volumes now before us are not however without interest and worth. It is only a portion of the former which was written by Pepys, and some of these, with many from his correspondents, might have been permitted to remain undeciphered, or at least unprinted, without loss to our historical literature. But we must be content to take the work as it is, and shall proceed to make a few extracts in order that our readers may judge for themselves of its worth. It is well

known that the popularity which attended the restoration was short lived. This might have been anticipated from its ultra character, yet few probably even of the most sagacious bystanders anticipated that it would decline so rapidly. The following allusion to this subject in a letter to Lady Sandwich, under date of February 8th, 1667, is in unison with what we learn from other quarters. The personal vices of the monarch were not more injurious to public morals than the political profligacy and distracted councils of the government were to the national reputation.

‘ The parliament rises this day, or to-morrow, having with much difficulty given the king a sum really too little, yet by them thought enough, if not too much, for his occasions. However, better thus much given, and they parted, than to have had them sit longer to have increased the discontents which were already come to great height between the court and the country factions.

‘ Our enemies are busy in their preparations, and bold, having begun the year with the unhappy taking of a very good frigate of ours, the St. Patrick, of about fifty guns, built but the last year. The news of her loss came to us but yesterday morning.

‘ We are in our preparations as backward as want of money and stores can render us, but do hope that what the parliament hath given us will, in a little time, better our condition ; yet not so, I assure your ladyship, as to give me any cause to be sorry for my lord’s being abroad, but contrarily to wish his continuance there some time longer ; although, should he return to-morrow, his lordship would find the world give him another look than when he left us, the last year’s work having sufficiently distinguished between man and man.

‘ Who commands the fleet this year is not yet known, but, for aught I see, there is no great striving likely to be for it, the Prince not being in condition of health, and the Duke of Albemarle, as I hear, declaring his not going. Whoever goes, I pray God give him more success than I can, without presumption, hope he will find.’

—Vol. i. pp. 115, 116.

The following, addressed to Lord Sandwich, then in Spain, Oct. 7th, is much to the same effect.

‘ Though your lordship’s silence (by Mr. Sheres) touching the receipt of either of those letters I have been bold to address to your lordship since your leaving England, denies me the satisfaction of knowing that they reached your lordship’s hands, yet I am unwilling, without more certainty, to take upon myself the shame, as well as affliction, which it were fit I should, did I know that your lordship had them not. And yet I must acknowledge, my lord, that this is but the third, having no desire of disquieting your lordship with bad news ; and the times affording not one passage fit to be called good, from the

hour I had the honor to see your lordship last, to that of publishing of your lordship's articles of peace with Spain: for, besides them, nothing that I know of, of public management, hath found so much as common excuse, much less the universal acceptance (which this hath done) in all this time.

'That after a war chargeably and unsuccessfully managed, as well as unsatisfactorily concluded, the parliament (who parted last upon jealous terms) is come together again this week, with as great an inclination on their side (as is believed) to inquire into faults, as the king is also said to be resolved on his to give way to their examining and correcting them. But their work, as it is thought, will be the less, by the late removal of my lord chancellor; an act wherein I cannot inform your lordship more, touching the grounds of it, than that its doing is generally imputed to reasons delivered the king by Sir W. C. (who I know do not spare to assert the requisiteness of it), with the concurrence at first of his royal highness, though afterward it proved not so pleasing to him, but that he is said to have endeavored the preventing it when it was gone too far.'—Ib. pp. 117—119.

Pepys's official situation brought him into frequent contact with the Duke of York, then lord high admiral, between whom and himself a growing intimacy and attachment appears to have arisen. Whatever were the grounds of the connexion between the secretary and his official superior, the fact itself is unquestionable, and goes far to account for the charge of popish inclinations which was alleged against the former. The nation had now begun rightly to estimate the character of the restored government. Men's minds passed from one extreme to another; from exultation to despondency, from implicit trust to inveterate suspicion and doubt. The Protestantism of the king was more than doubtful, while James's adhesion to the church of Rome was matter of notoriety. The religious fears of the nation were thoroughly roused, and the political liberalism which had survived the restoration sought to rally its forces under the No Popery cry. Good and bad men were temporarily united in opposition to the popish councils of the prince; and all who were known to possess his friendship were suspected of being favorable to his creed. Pepys suffered on this account, and the suspicion which attached to him was strengthened by the popish inclinations of his wife. He himself adverts, in his diary, to the wavering faith of Mrs. Pepys in the following terms—'Nov. 28th, 1668. My wife lately frighted me about 'her being a Catholique. I dare not, therefore, move her to 'go to church, for fear she should deny me.' Under these circumstances it was no marvel that Pepys's own faith should have been brought into doubt on the occasion of a petition being presented to the House of Commons in 1673, against his return

for Castle Rising. Pepys applied to the brother of his wife for evidence to rebut the charge preferred against him, and received in reply a communication from which we extract the following.

‘ HONoured SIR,

‘ I answer to yours of last night (which I received this morning at eight of the clock), I wonder indeed that you, whose life and conversation hath been ever known to be that of a sincere Protestant, should now be called in question of being a papist. But, sir, malice and envy will still oppress the best of men.

‘ Wherefore, sir, to the hazard of my life, I will prove (if occasion be), with my sword in my hand (since it hath touched so near of the memory of my dear sister), that your competitor is a false liar in his throat, as to your having either an altar in your house, or that my dear sister, ever since she had the honor to be your wife, or to her death, had the least thoughts of popery. This I know, not only by my often conversation with her, but in my presence, one time I remember, she having some discourse with my father concerning your life and conversation, as well as fortunes ; this was his speech with her, that amongst the greatest of the happinesses he enjoyed in his mind was that she had, by matching with you, not only wedded wisdom, but also one who by it, he hoped in Christ, would quite blow out those foolish thoughts she might in her more tender years have had of popery. These, to the best of my memory, were his very words.

‘ To which her reply was (kissing his eyes, which she loved dearly), ‘ Dear father, though in my tender years I was by my low fortune in this world deluded to popery by the fond dictates thereof, I have now (joined with my riper years, which give me more understanding), a man to my husband too wise, and one too religious in the Protestant religion, to suffer my thoughts to bend that way any more.’ But, sir, I have given you too much trouble with one thing.’—Ib. pp. 146—148.

The storm which threatened his fortunes passed over for a season, but it was not to be expected that he should escape uninjured amidst the violence and injustice which marked our national proceedings on the so-called Popish Plot. This was a season of insanity, when men’s fears were too violently excited to permit the calm exercise of their reason. Absolutists and liberals, Church of England men and nonconformists, political intriguers and upright religionists, partook in common of the almost universal mania. The nation was thoroughly alarmed, and in the height of its frenzy trampled alike on the claims of humanity and the spirit and precepts of the Christian faith. Mr. Pepys was known to be a favorite of the Duke of York, the leader and hope of the popish party, and was in consequence exposed to all the violence of the storm which then raged through the country. He was accused to the Commons of furnishing secret information respecting the English navy to

the French government, and of being himself a Roman Catholic, and a great promoter of the designs of that party. Under these charges he was committed to the Tower on the Speaker's warrant, May 22nd, 1679, where he remained until the following February, when he was discharged, on the attorney-general stating that the principal witness against him refused to abide by his original deposition. Several letters, written by him at this period, are contained in the present volumes, and will be read with considerable interest by all who are desirous of minute information respecting the period in question. Amongst the witnesses against Pepys, was a man named James, formerly his butler, who deposed that his master was a papist, and had kept in his house a priest in disguise. But being suddenly attacked by an alarming illness, he sought to ease his conscience by acknowledging that his evidence was false. The following letter to Mr. Povey, Feb. 25th, 1680, refers to this matter, and is too honorable to Pepys to be omitted.

‘ An occasion offers, wherein you may exercise that kindness you have sometimes exchanged with me; and it is this.

‘ You may, I doubt not, have heard that one James, who had been some time my servant, had been made use of as my accuser. He is now upon his sick-bed, and, as I am told, near the point of death; and has declared himself inclined to ease his conscience of something wherein I may be nearly concerned, with a particular willingness to open himself to you, whom he says he has known and observed during his serving the Duke of Buckingham and me.

‘ You may please, therefore, in charity to me as well as to the dying man, to give him a visit to-morrow morning, when I shall appoint one to conduct you to his lodging. It may be you may hesitate herein, because of the friendship which I no less know you to have with Mr. Harboard than you know him to have ill will against me, and of the effects of it, under which I still remain of being held obnoxious to others, to whom you bear great reverence.

‘ But that makes me the rather to importune you to the taking this trouble, because your candor is such, that, with a fair and equal indifference, you will hear and represent what that dying man shall relate to you, who, it is likely, will reveal at this hour nothing but truth. And it is to truth only, and the God thereof, I appeal, and which will, I hope, vindicate my reputation, and free me from the misunderstandings which I find many ingenuous and worthy persons have had of me, from their being seduced by the false testimonies which have been gained and improved to my disadvantage, even to the hazard of my life and estate, and no less to the disturbing of the government, than to the raising injurious reflections upon those public trusts in which I have (much to your knowledge) carried myself diligently, and (I am sure) faithfully.

‘ In this I, the rather, take the liberty of opening myself, thus freely and amply, to you upon this occasion; because I would move

you the more strongly, to take upon you this just and charitable office, so much importing others, as well as

‘Your most humble servant,

‘S. PEPYS.’

—Ib. pp. 206, 207.

James died a few days after this letter was written, and Pepys refers to his confession in a letter to his own father, from which we take the following.

‘It is long since I have expressed my duty to you, and truly one day has followed another with some new occasion of care, so that, though I have been in a great measure restored to the liberty of my person, my mind has continued in thraldom, till now that it has pleased God, in a miraculous manner, to begin the work of my vindication by laying his hand on James my butler, by a sickness (whereof he is some days since dead), which led him to consider and repent of the wrongs he had done me in accusing me in parliament, which he has solemnly and publicly confessed on the holy sacrament, justifying me and my family to all the world in that part of my accusation which relates to religion; and I question not but God almighty will be no less just in what concerns the rest of my charge, which he knows to be no less false than this. In the mean time, his holy name be praised for what he has done in this particular.’—Ib. 210, 211.

The political principles of Pepys harmonized well with those of his patron, and we find him consequently expressing his satisfaction with the duke’s administration of Scotch affairs, and in defiance of facts at once innumerable and notorious, specifying *gentleness* as one of its attributes. The extract is short, and we subjoin it.

‘Nevertheless, the authority the duke maintains with so much absoluteness, yet gentleness here, is a thing very considerable, rendering it morally impossible for any disquiet to arise in his majesty’s affairs in this kingdom. Truly, as their government seems founded on principles much more steady than those of ours, so their method of managing it in council (his royal highness having been pleased to give me opportunity of being present with him two council-days), appears no less to exceed ours in the order, gravity, and unanimity of their debates.’

—Ib. pp. 295, 296.

Amongst the disastrous results of the restoration, none was more strikingly obvious than the disorganization and consequent inefficiency of the English navy. The genius of the commonwealth had wrested from the Dutch the supremacy of the ocean, and had laid the foundation of that naval superiority which has been so triumphantly maintained in modern times. The profound intellect and unspotted integrity of Vane had

infused into this department of the public service a spirit of enterprise, courage, and self-confidence which rendered our seamen invincible, and changed the whole aspect of maritime affairs. The government of the Stuarts speedily undid what the high-minded republican had accomplished, and our fleets were in consequence insulted by foes whom they had formerly chased from the sea. The following admissions are too explicit to need comment.

‘ From the shameful want of discipline, the rest of the ships not ready to come out of Plymouth, with their flags, after my lord’s signals, one hour after another, and himself plying three or four hours under sail, going out. Morning, at sea, only the Woolwich in sight. So (with a fair wind for Plymouth), we were fain to lie by for them, losing our way all the while. Hamilton, in the Dragon, and Wheeler, in the Tiger (though shot at from my lord, not being under sail to come out) to the last.

‘ Yet, my lord, though infinitely vexed at this, and blaming it to me, plainly declared the misfortune of a man in his condition, carrying a flag, in a government where he cannot exercise the necessary discipline, for fear of making more enemies than he hath already ; the admiralty, themselves, being more likely to take part with the friends of those he should punish, than join him in it. Therefore, he was under a necessity to let them alone ; it being now (as we have often said to one another), a work for any man to set things right in the navy, but the Duke of York.

‘ He added (as mighty adventurous), that if the duke would take up the Admiralty, and had no mind to appear in the exercise of severity on captains, he would go to sea, and take all the odium on himself, rather than the duke should not take it up, and thereby save the navy, which will otherwise be undone.

‘ Yet I must add, that I doubt whether even the duke be now strong enough to mend things ; that is to say, without exposing himself to more envy and complaints, among friends of the rogues he should punish, than is fit to advise the duke to draw upon himself ; especially in his present circumstances. On this consideration, I think, he should not take it on him, till the king hath, of his own accord, first taken away, by good rules, the occasions of these people’s disorders, by taking away the money business and others. Then, seeing those rules executed, would become his duty to the king, and no act of his own.’

—lb. pp. 339, 340.

‘ Captain Macdonnell, in the Greyhound, in answer to the message to inquire after a ship seen yesterday in the offing, and thought to be a Salleeman, informs my Lord Dartmouth of Captain Lloyd’s being gone for England. Notwithstanding his pressing him to come to my lord, he would not, but proceeded in his voyage : hence sufficiently appear—

‘ I. The consequence of the king’s commanders taking in money, which Macdonnell brought us word he (Lloyd) had on board from Cales, that, let the business of the king’s be what it will, all shall give

way to private benefit; for otherwise he would, of course and curiosity, without any orders or entreaty, have come to a flag he met in the way, both to tell and to ask news.

‘II. These gentlemen-captains, depending on the interest of their friends at court, will venture to do what a plain tarpaulin, if he had no other reason, would never dare. This use my lord made of it, and said he would write it to the king.

‘III. That, where it is not a commander’s interest, he will plead want of written orders, as here Lloyd does, for his not coming to my lord, for so Macdonnell reports: but, when the contrary, he then thinks his discretion will justify his doing a thing, as he would have done his going out of the way to speak with a flag, notwithstanding his orders to go for England, if it had suited his other occasions.

‘IV. That a commander can easily get certificates of his ship’s being foul and out of order, unfit and unable to keep the sea, as Lloyd now pretends, and so is sent home by Shovell.

‘The master tells me Lloyd told him my lord did crowd sail, so that it was impossible to overtake his lordship: whereas Macdonnell says he told him no such thing, but that he went leisurely, for the sake of merchantmen he had with him.

‘Macdonnell was sent back again to overtake Lloyd and bring him back, his being with my lord being of great importance to the service we are going on. It will be worth minding what the event of the whole is, and to inquire at Tangier what orders he had for going home.

‘Captain Lloyd, though unfortunate in this accident towards my Lord Dartmouth, is said to be a very good artist, and curious in it above any gentleman-captain, therefore fit to be discoursed with about the matter of gentlemen’s being artists.’—Ib. pp. 351, 352.

The following is interesting, as settling a point which for some years past has engaged the attention of many scholars and divines. It is part of a letter from Mr. Daniel Skinner to Pepys, under date of November 19th, 1666, and accounts for the fact of Milton’s treatise *De Doctrina Christiana*, together with a corrected copy of all his Latin letters, being found in the State Paper Office, enclosed in an envelope, superscribed, ‘To ‘Mr. Skinner, Merchant.’ Mr. Skinner was at this time at Rotterdam, in attendance on Mr. Chudleigh, the secretary to the Dutch embassy.

‘After a hazardous passage cross the seas, though first a great expense in clothing myself for so great an appearance as this at Nimeguen, and a long, tedious, mighty chargeable journey through all the parts of Holland (a country serving only to set a greater value on our own), I at last arrived at Nimeguen, meeting with a very kind and (beyond expectation) fair reception from Mr Chudleigh, though (which is the misfortune I am telling you of) I was surprised with an unkind letter which his honor Sir Joseph Williamson had conveyed

before my arrival to my Lord Jenkyns concerning me. The whole business was thus :

‘ Your worship may please to remember, I once acquainted you with my having the works of Milton, which he left behind him to me, which, out of pure indiscretion, not dreaming any prejudice might accrue to me, I had agreed with a printer at Amsterdam to have them printed. As good fortune would have it, he has not printed one tittle of them. About a month ago there creeps out into the world a little imperfect book of Milton’s State Letters, procured to be printed by one Pitts, a bookseller in London, which he had bought of a poor fellow that had formerly surreptitiously got them from Milton. These coming out so slyly, and quite unknown to me, and when I had the true and more perfect copy, with many other papers, I made my addresses to Sir Joseph Williamson, to acquaint him that there was a book come out against his authority : that, if his honor connived at that, he would please to grant me licence to print mine ; if not, that he would either suppress that little book, or give me leave to put (in the bottom of the Gazette) that they were printing in Holland, in a larger, more complete edition.

‘ Now, sir (little thinking that Sir Joseph was such an enemy to the name of Milton), he told me he could countenance nothing of that man’s writings. In this answer I acquiesced. A little while after, his honor sends for me to know what papers I had of Milton’s by me, and that I should oblige him if I would permit them to his perusal ; which very readily I did, thinking that it might prove advantageous to me. And finding upon this so great an access to his honor, I presented him with a Latin petitionary epistle for some preferment, either under him or by his means. His honor was pleased graciously to receive it, and in a most expressive manner to promise me any advancement that might be in his power.

‘ During this, the opportunity of going to Nimeguen happened ; and, the day before I went out of England, I went to his honor for some recommendations. He returned me my papers with many thanks, and was pleased to give me a great deal of advice not to proceed in the printing of my papers at Amsterdam ; that it would be an undoubted rub in any preferments of mine : and this he said, he spoke out of mere kindness and affection to me. I returned his honor many humble thanks, and did expressively ensure him that, as soon as I got to Amsterdam (which I took in my way on purpose), I would return my copies, and suppress them for ever. Which, sir, I have done, and have followed his honor’s advice to every punctilio.

‘ Yet, notwithstanding this, his honor was pleased (whether I shall term it unkindly or unnaturally) to despatch a letter after me to my Lord Jenkyns, to acquaint his lordship that I was printing Milton’s works, and wished them to have a care of me in the king’s service ; which has put a little stop to my being employed as yet, till I can write to England, and procure so much interest as to clear Sir Joseph Williamson’s jealousy of my being yet engaged in the printing of these papers : though my Lord Jenkyns and Mr. Chudleigh are so well satisfied, after my giving them a full account of the business, and

bringing my copies with me to Nimeguen, ready to dispose of them where Sir Joseph should think fit, that they seem as much concerned at Sir Joseph's letter as I do, and have sent me here to Rotterdam at their charge (so kind they are), to remain here till I can write to England, and they have an answer from Sir Joseph Williamson how that his honor is satisfied; which they don't at all question but he will be when he shall hear what I have said and done.

' Now, may it please your worship, having given you a full and true account of the whole affair, seeing the fortune of a young man depends upon this small thing, either perpetual ruin, or a fair and happy way to future advancement; pray give me leave to beg of you, which I most humbly and submissively do, that you would please instantly to repair to his honor Sir Joseph, and acquaint him that I am so far from printing any thing from Milton's now, that I have followed his honor's advice, and upon due pensitation with myself have nulled and made void my contract with Elsevir at Amsterdam, have returned my copies to myself, and am ready to dispose of them where his honor pleases, either into the hands of my Lord Jenkyns, or into his own for better satisfaction; and am so far from ever procuring a line from Milton printed, that, if his honor pleases, he shall command my copies, and all my other papers, to the fire. And though I happened to be acquainted with Milton in his life-time (which out of mere love to learning I procured, and no other concerns ever past betwixt us but a great desire and ambition of some of his learning), I am, and ever was, so far from being in the least tainted with any of his principles, that I may boldly say, none has a greater honor and loyalty for his majesty, more veneration for the Church of England, and love for his country, than I have.'

—Ib. pp. 173—178.

We can make room only for one more extract, which will interest such of our readers as are acquainted with Dryden's *good parson*, to which it refers.

‘ JOHN DRYDEN, ESQ. TO PEPYS.

‘ PADRON MIO,

July 14, 1699.

‘ I remember, last year, when I had the honor of dining with you, you were pleased to recommend to me the character of Chaucer's *Good Parson*. Any desire of yours is a command to me, and accordingly I have put it into my English, with such additions and alterations as I thought fit.

‘ Having translated as many fables from Ovid, and as many novels from Boccace, and tales from Chaucer, as will make an indifferent large volume in folio, I intend them for the press in Michaelmas term next. In the mean time, my Parson desires the favor of being known to you, and promises, if you find any fault in his character, he will reform it. Whenever you please, he shall wait on you, and, for the safer conveyance, I will carry him in my pocket, who am,

‘ My Padron's most obedient servant,

‘ JOHN DRYDEN.

• PEPYS TO JOHN DRYDEN, ESQ.

• SIR,

Friday, July 14, 1699.

• You truly have obliged me, and, possibly, in saying so, I am more in earnest than you can readily think, as verily hoping from this your copy of one *Good Parson*, to fancy some amends made me for the hourly offence I bear with from the sight of so many lewd originals.

• I shall, with great pleasure, attend you on this occasion whene'er you'll permit it; unless you would have the kindness to double it to me, by suffering my coach to wait on you (and whom you can gain me the same favor from) hither, to a cold chicken and a salad, any noon after Sunday, as being just stepping into the air for two days.'

—Vol. ii. pp. 254—256.

Here we must close our notice of these volumes, though somewhat disposed to add a few words on the great desirability of a severer judgment than is usual being exercised in the selection which is made from the correspondence of eminent men. We estimate such publications as the present too highly to wish to impose any very stringent restraints on their editors; nor are we ignorant of the fact that what is uninteresting, and appears to be unimportant to one class of readers, may be regarded in a very different light by another. But after making every allowance which the most liberal criticism can require, we are strongly of opinion that the great ends of biography and history would be much better effected by winnowing the chaff more thoroughly from the wheat than is ordinarily done. A larger number of readers would thus be induced to acquaint themselves with the epistolary correspondence of past times, and a much more accurate notion of the events, spirit, and character of the days of our forefathers would thus be diffused through the general mass of our countrymen. The present volumes are not more faulty in this respect than is usual with works of their class—yet their value would certainly not have been diminished by the suppression of many of the letters which they contain.

Art. VIII. *The Hour and the Man. A Historical Romance.* By HARRIET MARTINEAU. Three Vols. London. Moxon.

AT the time when the star of Napoleon Bonaparte was rising in revolutionary France, another of similar brilliancy, but of purer light, was beginning to shine in St. Domingo, in the character of Toussaint L'Ouverture. How many tongues have celebrated his eminent qualities! How many eyes have wept over his melancholy fate!

Some have asserted that Toussaint was a native of Africa; but the most probable statement is that he was born on the plantation of the Count de Noé, near Cape François, about the year 1745. He is said, in early life, to have displayed peculiar kindness towards the brute creation, and to have possessed a patience of temper which scarcely anything could discompose. His amiable deportment conciliated the favor of M. Bayou de Libertas, the manager of the plantation, who appointed him his postilion; and having found means to learn reading, writing, and arithmetic, which not one negro in ten thousand could boast, he acquired great distinction among his fellow slaves.

When the insurrection of the negroes occurred in 1791, Toussaint was still a slave on the plantation, but refrained from taking any part in the first revolutionary movements. The spirit of vengeance wreaked its animosity alike on the humane master and the barbarous tyrant, and happy were those planters who could escape from the island. M. Bayou would have fallen into the hands of the infuriated blacks and suffered death, had not Toussaint delivered him from the impending destruction. He provided for his emigration to America, found means to embark a considerable quantity of sugar to support him in his exile, procured the escape of his family with him, and contrived every plan for his convenience.

Toussaint now entered the army of his country, which had begun to assume a regular form. He joined the corps commanded by Biassou, and was appointed next in command under him; but his superior being degraded from his station on account of his cruelties, Toussaint was invested with the chief command of the division. His character now gradually unfolded, and he displayed the same humanity and benevolence that had distinguished his more private life. Among his other great qualities, he was pre-eminent for unsullied integrity. It was the common proverb among the white inhabitants, that he 'never broke his word.' An unequivocal specimen of the reliance to be placed on his engagements was exhibited by many of the exiled planters and merchants, whom his promise of protection induced to return from distant countries to which they

had fled. These he restored to their estates, and inspired with confidence. At the time of his first elevation to rank, the contest between the blacks and their former masters had terminated; but another civil war soon arose, and was for some time carried on with the greatest fury between the friends of the dethroned French monarch, and those of the Convention. In this conflict, men of all complexions were on both sides; and the two parties comprehended nearly an equal number of blacks and whites. Toussaint espoused at first the cause of royalty, and his talents rendered it triumphant in St. Domingo, as it had been unsuccessful in France. Before Spain deserted the coalition formed by the great powers of Europe against the republicanism of France, he had the rank of general in the Spanish army conferred upon him, and was honored with the ancient military order of that country. But events soon induced him to think it neither politic nor patriotic to maintain his hostility to the French government. The planters and royalists had solicited the assistance of Great Britain, less for the sake of restoring the Bourbons in France than with the hope of recovering the iron rule of their own plantations. Toussaint was, therefore, compelled either to make amicable terms with the French Commissioners, or to unite with the British invaders and others whom he knew to be the foes of negro liberty. He, therefore, gave peace to the republicans he had conquered, and acknowledged the authority of the convention.

Henceforth, he showed his fidelity to the French government under every change that took place in its constitution. The representatives of that government sent from time to time to St. Domingo, though full of the spirit of exaction and cruelty, he managed with the utmost prudence, interposing frequently the shield of his influence between them, and the planters, and the jealous negroes. His benevolence was strikingly displayed in the rescue of General Lavaux, whom the negroes imprisoned at Cape François, and intended to put to death. This service was publicly acknowledged. On another occasion he displayed the heroic spirit of forgiveness, when several Frenchmen were taken, who had deserted him with aggravated treachery. He ordered their attendance at church; and when that part of the service was read which respects mutual forgiveness, he went with them to the front of the altar, and after pointing out the flagitiousness of their crime, ordered their immediate discharge from confinement. His conduct, also, to General Maitland was noble, contrasting with the perfidy he was urged to practise by the commissioners of the French republic. At the time when the treaty was negotiating for the British troops to evacuate St. Domingo, Maitland went to Toussaint's camp with only two or three attendants. Roume, the French commissioner, wrote

to Toussaint to embrace the favorable opportunity of detaining the British general prisoner. He was pre-warned of this plot on his way, but hesitated not to trust himself to the negro chief. On his arrival, Toussaint was absent, a circumstance he viewed with some discontent, not to say suspicion. At length he entered the room with two letters in his hand. 'There, general,' said he, 'before we talk together, read these: one is a letter just received from Roume, the other is my answer. I would not come to you till I had written my answer to him, that you may see how safe you are with me, and how incapable I am of baseness.' Maitland found one of the letters to be an artful persuasive to seize him, as an act of duty to the republic, the other an indignant refusal.

No sooner was the negro chief relieved from the warfare in which he had been engaged on behalf of his race, who almost adored him, than he devoted his entire attention to the arts of peace; and the whole system of his legislation was characterised by the same sagacity, prudence, and humanity, that had distinguished his exploits in the field. When he restored many of the planters to their estates slavery was gone; no human being was to be bought or sold. The greatest difficulty he had to overcome, however, was the indisposition to agricultural labour produced in the negro mind by the oppression and cruelty formerly practised. The planters, however, were now obliged to put their laborers on the footing of hired servants, and the negroes were required to labor for their own subsistence. Ample encouragement was afforded to industry by a legal arrangement for wages, and penalties were inflicted for the punishment of idleness. The effects of these regulations were soon visible; the progress of agriculture was such, that, notwithstanding the ravages of nearly ten years' war and other impediments to improvement, the land produced in the next crop full one-third of the quantity of sugar and coffee which it had ever before yielded in its most prosperous season; while the plantation negroes became healthful and happy. The population increased; and while situations of responsibility were filled by free negroes and mulattoes who were respectable under the former government, others were occupied by negroes, and even Africans, who had just emerged from slavery. In fact the general aspect of society, from the lowest to the highest of the inhabitants was that of comfort, peace, and prosperity. Having deemed it necessary for the public interest to frame a regular constitution for the future government of the island, Toussaint called to his assistance, for this purpose, several Europeans of talent, and having submitted the document to a general assembly of representatives, convened from every district, by whom it was approved and adopted, it was promulgated

in the name of the *people*, by a proclamation in due form on the first of July, 1801, and the island declared to be an independent state. Quiet and prosperity immediately followed; but, alas, were soon interrupted by European perfidy.

Peace having been restored between Great Britain and France, Bonaparte determined on sending an expedition across the Atlantic. It is probable that he regarded Toussaint with suspicion, and moreover, wanted employment for his numerous army. A fleet was accordingly collected in the harbours of Brest, L'Orient, and Rochford; and an army of twenty-five thousand men were embarked in the transports that accompanied it. Le Clerc, brother-in-law of the First Consul, was placed at the head of the army, while the fleet was commanded by Admiral Villaret, who had been in the royal service before the revolution. The two sons of Toussaint, who had been sent to France for education, were taken from their studies, and sent on board the fleet as hostages for the conduct of their father. This armament arrived at St. Domingo on the 28th of December, when Le Clerc dispatched three divisions of his force towards three points of the island at the same time. No sooner had General Rochambeau landed at Fort Dauphin, than the troops were drawn up in battle array, and the negroes without the least previous notice were charged with the bayonet, and fled from the fort. The next day the main body, under Villaret and Le Clerc, arrived off Cape François, and prepared to take possession of the town; but the black General Christophe sent a mulatto to inform the commander that the General-in-chief being absent in the interior, no disembarkation of any military force could be permitted till the return of the messenger who had been dispatched to inform him of the arrival of the French; that if they attempted to land, all the white inhabitants would be considered as hostages for their conduct, and that an attack upon the town would be followed by its immediate conflagration. Le Clerc, upon this, wrote a disingenuous letter consisting of conciliation and menaces, to which Christophe sent a dignified reply. A deputation from the inhabitants, headed by the mayor, went on board the fleet, and entreated the consideration of the General, representing that the blacks were determined to set fire to the city, and put all the white people to the sword on the first signal of disembarkation. They were dismissed without any promise, and an insidious proclamation of the First Consul was directed to be read. Having received intelligence, however, of Rochambeau's landing at Fort Dauphin, Le Clerc was by no means inclined to wait for Toussaint's arrival, but prepared at once to commence his operations. He hoped to gain the heights before the negroes put their threats into execution, but in vain; he only attained them to see the town in flames.

Christophe then retreated with the troops under his command, in good order, carrying off two thousand of the white inhabitants as hostages. As soon as Toussaint was informed of what had occurred, he lost no time in giving such directions as existing circumstances required, and though the consular gazettes expatiated on his cruelty and barbarity, the fact was that he pursued a humane and determined purpose to protect the French from the resentment of his brethren. General Moise, with many officers and troops under his command had revolted, not with views hostile to Toussaint and his government, but solely to wreak their vengeance on the whites. The insurrection, however, was soon quelled; but Moise, though his nephew and friend, and about thirty officers were brought to a court-martial for their sanguinary conduct, and publicly executed at the Cape. Thus did the Commander-in-Chief sacrifice the feelings of the man to the duties of the governor. But the agents of the French government made use of this piece of Roman heroism, to blacken his character by every odious calumny.

As soon as all the divisions of the French force had landed, Le Clerc made trial of a scheme to practise on the feelings of Toussaint. A letter was to be delivered from Bonaparte, and an interview to be effected between him and his two sons, who had been made to believe it was the interest of their father to comply with the proposal to be made to him. Coisnon, their tutor, was to introduce them, but they were not to be suffered to remain unless the father promised acquiescence in the wishes of the First Consul. His family circle joined their persuasions, but Toussaint had wit enough to see the snare, and with anguish yet heroic firmness he said, after a brief struggle, 'Take back my children, since it must be so. I will be faithful to my brethren and my God.' A correspondence ensued between him and Le Clerc, during which there was a truce of some days. Le Clerc, however, became impatient, and renewed hostilities, proclaiming Toussaint and Christophe 'out of the protection of the law.' The contest that ensued was severe, accompanied by various successes and repulses on both sides at particular points. Two thousand black troops under Maurepas, however, went over to the French, and the insidious promises of Le Clerc, induced many other leading individuals to follow the example, while most of the negro troops became weary of the war. The constancy, however, of the black general never forsook him, and though unable to meet his enemies in the field, he was still unconquered. Almost the whole French army was employed against Crete-a-Pierrot, a fortress between Port au Prince, and St. Marc, which was under the command of Dessalines, one of the most skilful of all the negro generals. It was at length possessed; but the atrocities of the French stain

the page of history on this occasion. Six hundred blacks were surrounded by General Hardy, and deliberately put to death, and a similar tragedy was enacted at Trianon. Elated with success, Le Clerc immediately put the plantation negroes again under the driver and the whip. The poor cultivators now found their mistake in listening to the French declarations of liberty, and the planters themselves were afraid to take possession of their estates. Toussaint saw, in this imprudent baseness of his enemies, the hope of retrieving his affairs; and with this view, in the month of April he abandoned the mountains, and effecting a junction with Christophe, hastened towards the northern coast, where he defeated the troops of France, and brought the cultivators in great numbers to his standard. He drove everything before him, and even without battering artillery, very nearly captured Cape François. Le Clerc now perceived the fatal consequences of his duplicity, and resolved on issuing a proclamation with a view of reassuring his unhappy dupes of his regard for negro freedom! It was so insidiously constructed as instantly to produce the desired effect; and the black chiefs were necessitated by the first week in May to conclude a peace, by which the sovereignty of France over the island of St. Domingo was acknowledged by all its inhabitants.

Toussaint retired to a plantation at Gonaives on the southwest coast, called after his own name L' Ouverture, where in the bosom of his family he sought tranquillity and repose. But perceiving the negro general in his power, Le Clerc practised one of the basest acts of treachery that ever disgraced a man or a government. In the dead of night the Creole frigate and the Hero, a seventy-four gun ship, were dispatched from Cape François and stood in to Gonaives; when several boats with troops landed and surrounded the house of Toussaint, who with his family was reposing in unsuspecting slumber. Brunet, a brigadier-general, and Ferrari, aide-de-camp to Le Clerc, entered with a file of grenadiers and required him instantly to go with his family on board the frigate. Resistance was useless; Toussaint submitted, soliciting in vain that his wife and children might be suffered to remain; and before the neighborhood could be alarmed all were on board the Hero and under sail for France. A hundred of the confidential friends of Toussaint were arrested also, and, without any other imputation of crime, some were hurried on board the frigate La Muiron, bound to the Mediterranean, and the rest distributed through the squadron. What became of these wretched captives was never known. During the voyage Toussaint was allowed no intercourse with his family; and on their arrival at Brest, after a moment's interview with them on deck (and it was the last) he was conveyed, under an escort of cavalry, to the castle of Joux,

in Normandy. At the commencement of winter the unfortunate negro chief, after being immured in a miserable dungeon, expired on the 27th of April, 1803.

Such are the general facts connected with the life of Toussaint L'Ouverture, which Miss Martineau has chosen as the basis of a 'historical romance.' The real history is indeed itself a romance, and required little embellishment or amplification. She has accordingly added very few imaginary personages, and these barely sufficient to form amusing under-plots to the main story. The title combines the headings of two of the chapters, from one of which we shall furnish an extract by which the reader may be enabled to judge of the nature of the work and the method of its execution. It is 'the hour' of changing sides, and Toussaint is with the French priest Laxabon.

' ' Father,' said he, commanding his voice completely, ' is there not hope, that if men, weakened and blinded by degradation, mistake their duty when the time for duty comes, they will be forgiven ?'

' ' In what case, my son ? Explain yourself.'

' ' If I, hitherto a slave, and wanting, therefore, the wisdom of a free man, find myself engaged on the wrong side,—fighting against the providence of God,—is there not hope that I may be forgiven on turning to the right ?'

' ' How the wrong side, my son ? Are you not fighting for your king, and for the allies of France ?'

' ' I have been so pledged and so engaged ; and I do not say that I was wrong when I so engaged and so pledged myself. But if I had been wise as a free man should be, I should have foreseen of late what has now happened, and not have been found, when last night's sun went down (and as to-morrow night's sun shall not find me), holding a command against the highest interests of my race,—now, at length, about to be redeemed.'

' ' You—Toussaint Breda—the loyal ! If Heaven has put any of its grace within you, it has shown itself in your loyalty ; and do you speak of deserting the forces raised in the name of your king, and acting upon the decrees of his enemies ? Explain to me, my son, how this can be. It seems to me that I can scarcely be yet awake.'

' ' And to me it seems, father, that never till now have I been awake. Yet it was in no vain dream that I served my king. If he is now where he can read the hearts of his servants, he knows that it was not for my command, or for any other dignity and reward, that I came hither, and have fought under the royal flag of France. It was from reverence and duty to him, under God. He is now in heaven ; we have no king ; and my loyalty is due elsewhere. I know not how it might have been if he had still lived ; for it seems to me now that God has established a higher royalty among men than even that of an anointed sovereign over the fortunes of many millions of men. I think now that the rule which the free man has over his own soul,—over time and eternity,—subject only to God's will,—is a nobler

authority than that of kings ; but, however I might have thought, our king no longer lives ; and, by God's mercy, as it seems to me now, while the hearts of the blacks feel orphaned and desolate, an object is held forth to us for the adoration of our loyalty,—an object higher than throne and crown, and offered us by the hand of the King of kings.'

‘‘ Do you mean freedom, my son ? Remember that it is in the name of freedom that the French rebels have committed the crimes which—which it would consume the night to tell of, and which no one knows better, or abhors more than yourself.’

‘‘ It is true : but they struggled for this and that and the other right and privilege existing in societies of those who are fully admitted to be men. In the struggle, crime has been victorious, and they have killed their king. The object of my devotion will now be nothing that has to be wrenched from an anointed ruler, nothing which can be gained by violence,—nothing but that which, being already granted, requires only to be cherished, and may best be cherished in peace,—the manhood of my race. To this must I henceforth be loyal.’

* * * * *

‘‘ Well. Explain, explain what you propose.’

‘‘ I cannot remain in an army opposed to what are now the legal rights of the blacks.’

‘‘ You will give up your command ?’

‘‘ I shall.’

‘‘ And your boys,—what will you do with them ?’

‘‘ Send them whence they came for the present. I shall dismiss them by one road, while the resignation of my rank goes by another.’

‘‘ And you yourself by a third.’

‘‘ When I have declared myself to General Hermona.’

‘‘ Have you thoughts of taking your soldiers with you ?’

‘‘ No.’

‘‘ But what is right for you is right for them.’

‘‘ If they so decide for themselves.—My power over them is great. They would follow me with a word. I shall therefore avoid speaking that word, as it would be a false first step in a career of freedom, to make them enter upon it as slaves to my opinion and my will.’

‘‘ But you will at least address them, that they may understand the course you pursue. The festival of this morning will afford an opportunity—after mass. Have you thought of this?—I do not say that I am advising it, or sanctioning any part of your plan : but have you thought of this ?’

‘‘ I have, and dismissed the thought. The proclamation will speak for itself. I act from no information which is not open to them all. They can act, thank God, for themselves : and I will not seduce them into subservience, or haste, or passion.’

‘‘ But you will be giving up everything. What can make you think that the French at Cap, all in the interest of the planters, will receive you ?’

‘‘ I do not think it ; and I shall not offer myself.’

‘‘ Then you will sink into nothing. You will no longer be an officer, nor even a soldier. You will be a mere negro, where negroes

are wholly despised. After all that you have been, you will be nothing.'

‘‘ I shall be a true man.’

‘‘ You will sink to less than nothing. You will be worse than useless before God and man. You will be held a traitor.’

‘‘ I shall ; but it will be for the sake of a higher fidelity.’

* * * * *

‘ Toussaint payed him his wonted reverence, and left the tent.

‘ Arrived in his own, he threw himself on the couch like a heart-broken man.

‘‘ No help ! no guidance ! ’ thought he. ‘ I am desolate and alone. I never thought to have been left without a guide from God. He leaves me with my sins upon my soul, unconfessed, unabsolved : and, thus burdened and rebuked, I must enter upon the course which I dare not refuse. But this voice within me which bids me go,—whence and what is it ? Whence is it but from God ? And how can I therefore say that I am alone ? There is no man that I can rely on,—not even one of Christ’s anointed priests ; but is there not he who redeemed men ? and will he reject me if, in my obedience, I come to him ? I will try,—I will dare. I am alone ; and he will hear and help me.’

‘ Without priest, without voice, without form of words, he confessed and prayed, and no longer felt that he was alone. He arose, clear in mind, and strong in heart : wrote and sealed up his resignation of his commission, stepped into the next tent to rouse the three boys, desiring them to dress for early mass, and prepare for their return to their homes immediately afterwards.’—Vol. i. pp. 136—151.

The ninth chapter is headed ‘The Man.’ The news that Toussaint was gone over from the allies to republican France soon became universal in Cape François, and that this step had been followed by a large defection from the allied forces. Toussaint and Henri Christophe took possession of the town, released General Laveaux from prison, and spread universal joy among the French.

We have been much pleased with these volumes ; chiefly, perhaps, for the hero’s sake. In some passages there is a decided failure, from the want of probability ; while in others there is unquestionably much to interest and impress. A Walter Scott would have found this a fine subject for his genius. We are glad, however, it has now been treated, and in a manner which does no discredit to a clever writer, though it is not perhaps the best production of the author’s pen.

Art. IX. 1. *Extracts from Papers Printed by the order of the House of Commons, 1839, relative to the West Indies.* By Authority. London: 1840.

2. *A Winter in the West Indies, described in Familiar Letters to Henry Clay, of Kentucky.* By JOSEPH JOHN GURNEY. London: 1840.
3. *The Present Condition of the West Indies; their Wants, and the Remedy for These: with some Practical Hints showing the Policy of a New System for their future Regeneration.* By HENRY MORSON. London: 1841.
4. *Past and Present Efforts for the Extinction of the African Slave-trade.* By W. R. GREG. London: 1841.
5. *Emancipation.* By WILLIAM E. CHANNING. London: 1841.

THERE is an important sense in which the phrase we have adopted as the running title of this article is far from being applicable to the subject to which we have applied it. The results of emancipation—of the emancipation, that is to say, of the eight hundred thousand bondsmen who lately watered with their sweat and blood the West Indian possessions of Great Britain, are as yet, in their completeness, no matters of discussion, for they are not yet in existence. The influence of this great measure stretches both so wide and so far; it spans, not only so broad an expanse of waters—for it will assuredly reach the continent of Africa—but so vast an expanse of time—since it will affect the character of all coming ages—that it is precipitate, even to trifling, to speak as though we saw, at the present moment, anything which can properly be called the results of emancipation. We may observe, indeed, things which have resulted from it, as we may observe what has resulted from the husbandman's toil, when we see the clean ploughed furrow, the smooth raked earth that covers the seed, or the light green hue with which it is clothed by the up-springing blade; but it is for them to speak of *the result* of his labors, who shall see the waving yellow crop, and the industry of the harvest field. Not more, at the largest amount, than the tender herb to the ripened corn, are present results of negro emancipation to the harvest of unmeasurable good of which it is to be productive.

Using the term with this qualification, however, there is enough in the results of emancipation, as at present visible, to furnish matter of interesting inquiry and gratifying record, more especially as its immediate effect was anticipated by many persons with real or feigned alarm. We propose, therefore, to devote a few pages, under the guidance of the works named at the head of this article, to a statement of the present, and an inquiry into the prospective issue of emancipation in our West India colonies.

Before we enter upon our task, it will be proper to give some brief account of the works upon our table.

During the parliamentary session of 1839, there were laid on the table of the House of Commons voluminous papers on the state of the British West Indies, during the critical period which elapsed between the spring of 1838 and that of the following year. On the first of August, 1838, emancipation took place; the period we have named, therefore, comprehends the time immediately preceding that change, and immediately following it. At this period the stipendiary magistrates were in the official habit—a habit which has subsequently been most injuriously discontinued—of making monthly reports to the colonial governors, of all things which they deemed material to a correct knowledge of the state of affairs. These reports, although far from being in all cases what they ought to have been, brought to head quarters, and ultimately to the British government and the British parliament, an immense amount of invaluable information, and contributed to most important beneficial effects. As a class—we are happy in having this opportunity of saying it—the stipendiary magistrates of the West Indies have deserved well of their country; and their services, performed amidst accumulated difficulties and implacable hostility, entitle them to the warm approbation and high esteem of every friend of freedom and humanity. The reports of these functionaries, together with the despatches of colonial governors, are the staple of the volume which we have placed at the head of our list, as at once of the largest bulk and of the highest authority. It is a thick, but not a cumbrous octavo volume, consisting, as the title says, of extracts from papers printed by order of the House of Commons in 1839, relative to the West Indies. It is an admirable digest of the documents relating to emancipation and its immediate consequences, prepared, as it appears, by direction of government, in order to throw the important information contained in the parliamentary papers into a form generally accessible and easily available. Its price is extremely small; and every person who wishes to know upon authority the facts of the case, or to be able to refer to authority in relation to them, should place it in his library. Thanks are certainly due to the government, for the careful preparation and economical publication of it.

The work of Mr. Gurney, *A Winter in the West Indies*, although illustrative of the same subject, is the antipodes of that we have just noticed. It is the narrative of a well informed and highly cultivated traveller, who suffers nothing to escape him, and looks upon every thing with a benevolent, and generally a discriminating eye. With a view to render his volume useful in the United States, he has thrown it into the form of

letters to an American correspondent ; and he has chosen for his correspondent on this occasion the eminent statesman and slaveholder, Henry Clay. We are not sure that we agree with the author in the supposition, by which no doubt he was actuated, that addressing the letters to Mr. Clay was adapted to give them greater weight with the slaveholders of the Union ; but this we are sure of, that Mr. Gurney has lost sight, for the moment, of all moral distinctions, in addressing Mr. Clay as—‘ My dear friend.’ The only thought by which we can reconcile ourselves to the use of this appellation is, that it is a Quaker form of expression, and means nothing ; but, if we are wrong in this, we can only deplore that so excellent and eminent a man should have so forgotten himself, even for a moment. In no respect are the principles or habits of Henry Clay such as can induce Joseph John Gurney to rank that gentleman among his ‘ dear friends ;’ and it was of some importance to society, more especially in the United States, that a good man should have taken such an opportunity of reprobating, rather than countenancing, a bad one. We should make a similar remark, would our space permit, respecting Mr. Gurney’s fond appellation of another American slaveholder—‘ our friend, J. C. Calhoun,’ p. 225.* Of facts which he observed in the West

* To *A Winter in the West Indies* is prefixed a Prefatory Letter to the author’s brother-in-law, Sir T. F. Buxton, in which he declares himself in favor of the African Civilization Society. We are not about to make any general reference to this subject, on which we have already expressed our opinion. We notice the Prefatory Letter merely to say, that we think our traveller disposes most unsatisfactorily of the bearing of the association we have named on the professed peace principle of the Society of Friends. As a Friend, Mr. Gurney holds the unlawfulness of war : yet he is willing to take part in founding colonies which are to have military protection, because that ‘ point is under the sole care of government,’ p. viii. Again, the expedition to the Niger is armed to the teeth, and the Civilization Society is to ‘ co-operate with ’ that expedition ; to which our author reconciles himself by the etymological consideration, that ‘ the word ‘co-operate’ seems to point out the action of independent parties.’ He thinks the Society ‘ stands on a safe ground,’ while it confines its co-operation ‘ to matters purely pacific,’ and that ‘ it cannot be considered responsible for a collateral circumstance, distinctly disapproved by some of its members, which it has done nothing to promote, and which belongs exclusively to the independent action of government,’ ib. All this is to us utterly inconclusive, and partakes painfully of the character of evasion. Upon the principle here resorted to, Roman Catholics may prove that they never burnt a heretic. All that they have ever done has been to accept the service of the secular arm. They have ‘ confined their co-operation to matters purely religious, while the murdering part ‘belonged exclusively to the independent action of government.’ Is it possible that any members of the body of Friends, clear-sighted and inflexible as they have generally shown themselves, are about to fall into such a snare ; to identify themselves with a military system, and to become—they who have been so often choked with gnats—the swallowers of a camel ?

Indies, his representations are beyond doubt of the greatest accuracy and value. All is true that he has told, and a most important witness to the value of emancipation he is. We think, however, that he has not told all that is true. The goodness of his heart, we suspect, has allowed him to leave untold some things, which go to make up the full amount of iniquity on the planters' side of the account, in the West Indies.

The pamphlet of Dr. Channing has been dictated by his perusal of Mr. Gurney's Letters, and consists in part of a spirited abstract of their more important contents, to which are appended some observations of his own. It is strongly marked by the author's characteristic eloquence and nobleness of sentiment, and will fascinate every reader. It concludes with some important remarks on the subject of American slavery, a subject of which, in our last number, we took an extended notice.

The remaining pamphlets on our list emanate from the West India party. They treat of the present state of the West Indies in respect of labor and production, and allege a great amount of evil, as a remedy for which they call for a large immigration of laborers. The writers, however, although they agree in this general view, are different men. Mr. Greg makes his appearance in a mask, and sets a gin for abolitionists, by pretending—we really do not think him sincere—a great anxiety for the abolition of the slave-trade. He is evidently of the old school. Mr. Morson is of the new; and treats the question with a frankness and generosity to which, from men of his party, we are quite unaccustomed. We hail with unfeigned pleasure the growth of such a spirit as he manifests among the West India proprietary; and we have only to hope that it may speedily become universal. We shall say a few words on the subject of these pamphlets before we have done.

In attempting a statement of the present results of emancipation, we need not make more than a passing reference to the falsification it has afforded of the gloomy and terrific predictions which so long served as a scarecrow to prevent its accomplishment. Verily the authors of them were no prophets, and their terrors, whether real or pretended, are become mirth for children. In looking at the many gratifying accounts which the works on our table present to us, we are embarrassed by their multiplicity, and by the smallness of our space. Suffice it to say in general, therefore, that in all that relates to the physical comfort and domestic and social happiness of the former slaves, emancipation has done every thing that the most sanguine could have expected from it. They have shown that they know well the value of money, and of all the comforts that money can purchase; and that they are promptly accessible to all the influences which actuate the rest of mankind. After spending

the day of emancipation like a Sabbath, they entered at once on the career of improvement ; and a peasantry more universally or more rapidly improving does not exist in the world. The prompt and steady augmentation of imports to the colonies demonstrates their growth in physical comforts, while the outcry for schools in every quarter proclaims their thirst for knowledge. In every way they are getting on ; and nothing, as it seems, will be able to resist the impetus with which our late bondsmen are making progress towards general competency, worth, and respectability. In this respect emancipation has been no failure ; and the friends of humanity may profoundly rejoice in what they have done.

There is another side, however, of this subject. It remains to be asked, what has emancipation done for the planter. Has it not ruined him ? Has it not deprived him of labor, destroyed the value of his estate, sunk his capital, and beggared his family ? All these things have been loudly affirmed ; but there is not a particle of truth in the allegation. The immediate effect of emancipation was to create a new commodity—labor—for sale. This, like all other commodities, immediately came to market ; and, like them, it was offered at its market price. Whoever would come into the market, and give the market price for it, never wanted labor. Those who would not, could not get it ; and they would have found just the same difficulty in getting yams or cocoas, if they had tried the same method. This was nothing but common sense. If a laborer had consented to take less than the market price for his labor, his task-master might have pointed us to the fact in derision, and have said—‘ I told you he was a fool.’

What, then, was the price which labor established for itself in the colonial market ? Was it not such as to make plantation work more costly than before, and, indeed, ruinously expensive ? On the contrary, work was done cheaper than ever, not excepting the digging of cane-holes and the manufacture of sugar. One of the heads under which the contents of the parliamentary papers are arranged in the volume before us, is entitled ‘ Cost of cultivation by free labor, and value of property.’ We wish we could insert the whole of this section, for the value of the evidence by which the assertion we have made above is demonstrated ; but we must content ourselves with an extract. Mr. Grant, stipendiary justice in Jamaica, writes thus on the 9th of February, 1839.

‘ With regard to the expenditure of properties, I am confident that cultivation can be carried on at much less expense than under the former system.....

‘ I know a property on which there were 350 slaves. The amount

expended on account of labor, from the 1st of August to the 31st of December last, on this property, was £449 1s. On an average, between taxes, clothing, medicine, medical attendance, &c., each apprentice or slave cost the owner of the property at least £5; this, for the year, would be £1,750, and at the same rate, for the five months, £725. The annual rent of houses, gardens, and grounds on the property, will amount to £500 per annum; and at the same rate, for the five months, it amounts to £208 6s. 8d., which sum, deducted from the £449 1s. expended in labor, leaves a balance of £240 14s. 4d. as the outlay for labor required on the property for the five months; and for the same space of time the expense of apprenticeship, or slave contingencies, would amount to £725, leaving a balance in favor of the expense required for free labor of £484 5s. 8d.; and the late deficiency law required five people, besides the overseer, doing militia duty, to be employed at salaries, and maintained on the property. The saving effected by the change in this particular is very great. The book-keepers are now dispensed with.

'The supercession of a free system has been a great relief to the owners of unproductive properties. They were bound to give the prescribed allowances to their slaves, without reference to their own profits. To illustrate this position, I can point out a property on which were settled 100 slaves. The lowest estimate of expenditure on their account is £500 a year, and the possession, notwithstanding the high price of produce, has of late years regularly increased the owner's debt. Since 1st August to 31st December, the labor account has amounted to £99 4s. 2d. The usual cultivation has been carried on and improved; the pastures, hitherto neglected, are cleaned; and about 30 acres of coffee, which had grown up to the state best described by 'ruinate,' have been opened. The produce, small as it is, now secured, will pay all the expenses of the plantation; and, even in this first year of experiment, place the proprietor on a better footing than under a continuance of the previous system he ever could have hoped for. The collection of a rent from 1st November to 1st February will be a further relief.'—*Extracts*, pp. 173, 174.

The cost of plantation labor under the two systems is placed in a clear light by Mr. Ramsay, another stipendiary magistrate, in the following passage. The sterling value of Jamaica currency may be taken at two-thirds of the nominal amount.

'During slavery and the apprenticeship, the jobber charged from £10 to £12 per acre for digging, with his slaves or apprentices, an acre of land into cane-holes: now, at wages of 1s. 8d. per day, an acre of cane-holes may be dug for the sum of £2 10s. currency; at 2s. 1d. wages, it will cost £3 2s. 6d.; at 2s. 6d. wages, it will cost £4 10s.; and at 3s. 4d., the highest rate of wages that I have heard of, it will cost only £5, just one-half what it cost in times past.'

—*Ib.* p. 175.

That, however, which puts this question beyond all possibility of doubt is, that, by task-work, which is a sure and infallible

mode of testing the real value of labor in the market, and of securing for the purchaser of it a full equivalent for his money at the market price, work of all kinds is done considerably cheaper than by wages, and in all cases far cheaper than in slavery. On this point Mr. Gurney adduces the following decisive statement of Dr. Stewart, a Jamaica planter, from a letter written in March, 1840.

“With regard to the comparative expense of free and slave labor,” says he, “I give you the result of my experience in this parish. *Wherever rent and labor have not been mingled together*, prices have been reduced, in the picking and curing of coffee, from one third to one half; from £10 per tierce, to from £5 to £6 10. Grass land is cleaned at one-third of the former expense. A pen in this neighborhood, when cleaned in slavery, cost, simply for the contingencies of the negroes, £80. The first cleaning by free labor—far better done—cost less than £24. Stone walls, the only fence used in this rocky district, cost £5 6s. 8d. per chain, the lowest £4, under slavery. The usual price now is £1, the highest £1 6s. 8d. per chain. To prepare and plant an acre of woodland in coffee cost, twenty years ago, £20; up to the end of slavery, it never fell below £16. In apprenticeship it cost from £10 13s. 4d. to £12. Now it never exceeds £5 6s. 8d. I myself have done it this year for £5; that is the general price all through the district. In 1833, I hired servants at from £16 to £25 per annum. In 1838, 1839, and since, I have been able to obtain the same description of servants, vastly improved in all their qualifications, for from £8 to £10 per annum.” These are pound, shilling, and pence calculations; but they develop mighty principles—they detect the springs of human action—they prove the vast superiority of moral inducement to physical force, in the production of the useful efforts of mankind. It is the perfect settlement of the old controversy between wages and the whip.—*Winter in the West Indies*, pp. 154, 155.

The immediate result of emancipation, therefore, has been as beneficial to the planter as to the peasant, and has furnished both with equal cause of gratulation.

That this has been substantially the case, is manifest from the position which West India property has maintained in the market, through the whole of this critical period. We are not going to cite the instances (although there is no doubt of the facts) in which estates have sold for more since freedom than they would have brought under slavery; for there is fallacy in them. They are altogether beside the mark. The case is really this. During slavery the market value of a plantation was reckoned, neither by acres of land nor by extent of buildings, but by slaves exclusively, at so much per head. The seller said, ‘Buy my slaves, and I will give you both the buildings and the land.’ At that time, then, the *estates*, strictly speak-

ing, were worth nothing; the whole value lying in the human stock. By the marvellous and infatuated grant of twenty millions sterling, this country bought the stock, without taking those lands and buildings which the proprietors were so ready to throw in as a makeweight to any other purchaser. At that time these were worth nothing. What have they been worth since? The estates without the slaves have been universally worth as much as the slaves and estates together! That is to say, the act of emancipation has doubled the real property of West India proprietors. It has first of all put the value of their estates as they were into their pockets in hard cash, by purchasing the only element of them which had any value, the slaves; and it has then, by a sort of magic, created a new value, of at least equal amount, in the lands and buildings, which before had no value at all. When to this we add, that, generally speaking, land in the West Indies has had a rising value ever since emancipation, and is rising still, we cannot but think it fully manifest that this act of justice is working as well for the planter as the laborer. On this point let us again hear Mr. Gurney.

‘There can be no better testimony in Jamaica on this subject than that of A. B. He assured me that landed property in that island now, without the slaves, is worth its full former value including the slaves, during the times of depression which preceded the act of emancipation. It has found its bottom, has risen, and is still gradually rising. ‘I believe in my conscience,’ says Dr. Stewart, ‘that property in Jamaica, without the slaves, is as valuable as it formerly was with them. I believe its value would be doubled by sincerely turning away from all relics of slavery, to the honest free working of a free system.’

—Ib. pp. 156, 157.

The value of land, however, is but another name for the value of labor. Land which is to be cultivated is worth nothing where there are no hands to cultivate it; and it reaches a higher value according to the facility of obtaining suitable labor. To say that estates fetch a good and rising price, is to say that there is no want of labor for the cultivation of them. Here is proof, therefore, that there has been no scarcity of labor in the West Indies. The market for estates could not have been so good, if the market for labor had been really bad. The one exactly reflects the other. And the rising value of estates, like a mirror, exhibits, with unquestionable fidelity, the general and willing industry of the emancipated peasantry. How well sagacious West Indians knew this, and for what reason merry England was made to ring with the clamor of planters’ ruin, may be gathered from the following statement of Mr. Grant, the sti-

pendiary magistrate before referred to, on the 10th of June, 1839.

‘I have remarked that the persons who are loudest in proclaiming the deplorable state of the country, are the very persons who grasp most firmly the property they have in it, and, if they have the means, are most willing to purchase more. This *may* be honest. They *may* be doing this without any sinister motive. I know of one of them who purchased a property about three years ago. He was lately offered nearly treble the amount he gave for it. Did he take it? No; but in the same breath he would assert that the country was ruined.’—*Extracts*, p. 176.

We may be asked how the view we have given can be reconciled with the falling off of the supply of sugar, by which the country, for the last eighteen months, has suffered so much. Nothing is more easy; inasmuch as it is demonstrable that the deficiency has not arisen from emancipation. It has followed emancipation, it is true; but this is through the simultaneous operation of those other causes to which it is really to be referred. To prove, however, what we have asserted. We suppose it will be allowed, that whatever has resulted from emancipation should be found in all the emancipated colonies; like causes producing, in similar circumstances, like effects. If a defective cultivation of sugar had arisen from the release of the slaves, it should have appeared wherever slaves had been released; that is to say, the sugar crop should have fallen off in all the colonies. Our readers perhaps will ask, Did it not do so? We answer, decidedly not. In only two, out of the whole number, was there a short crop; these were British Guiana and Jamaica. Why there was a short crop there is of no consequence to the argument; we affirm that nothing more absurd or more fraudulent was ever attempted, than to construe a deficiency of sugar from two colonies into proof of deficient labor in a score. In all the rest there was as much sugar made as usual, in some of them more; and the inference is irrefragable, that the causes of the deficiency, where it has existed, are not general (as the influence of emancipation must have been) but local.

Although it is not necessary to the validity of this argument that we should specify the sources of the local deficiency, we will say a word on this subject in passing. The manufacture of sugar is extensively affected by variations of the seasons, and rapid changes of productiveness occur, between a widely separated maximum and minimum quantity. In 1838 and 1839, British Guiana suffered from excessive drought; and no possible increase of labor, or industry of laborers, could have made a

large crop of sugar. Hence (we take the statement from Mr. Morson's pamphlet, p. 34), while the produce of 1835 was 107,586,405 lbs.; that of 1838 was 77,052,737 lbs.; and that of 1839, 47,522,000. lbs. On the authority of private letters given in the *Colonial Gazette* (an unexceptionable authority) of the 6th of January last, we learn that the present season is highly favorable, and that the crop is expected to exceed 40,000 hhds. Now, we may reckon this at about 900,000 cwt., or 100,800,000 lbs.; an extraordinary increase on the last two years of drought, and a near approximation to the large produce of 1835. More recent accounts, some of them from official sources, confirm the highly productive character of the present season in Guiana, and the remarkable general prosperity of the colony.

In Jamaica, the cause of the deficiency was not so much in the temper of the heavens, as in that of the planters. The untameable perverseness which set the House of Assembly in such ludicrous opposition to the home government, diffused itself through almost the entire resident plantocracy, under the form of a determination not to accommodate themselves to the new system. Modes of oppression and vexation without end were resorted to, in order either to coerce labor, or to get it without paying the market price for it; and the consequence was, that the laborers did just what any Englishman would have done with his produce of any kind, they took the article to market no longer, but consumed it themselves. Such was the opinion which Mr. Gurney formed on the spot.

'Now, so far as this decrease of produce is connected with the change of system, it is obviously to be traced to a corresponding diminution in the quantity of labor. But here comes the critical question—the real turning point. To what is this diminution in the quantity of labor owing? I answer deliberately, but without reserve, 'Mainly to causes which class under slavery, and not under freedom.' It is, for the most part, the result of those impolitic attempts to force the labor of freemen, which have disgusted the peasantry, and have led to the desertion of many of the estates.'—*Winter in the West Indies*, p. 172.

For the peasantry themselves nothing could have been happier. The insane system of oppression weaned them from their fond attachment to the old dens of cruelty, and originated a system of independent location, under which free villages are already adorning, like gems, the bosom of the Isle of Springs. Late accounts inform us that the peasantry in Jamaica are 'working better.' The meaning of this is that the planters are behaving better. We shall very gladly forget the errors, which we hope they are rapidly abandoning.

We cannot close this branch of our subject without saying that the ground we have taken respecting the results of emancipation, is both extraordinarily and unnecessarily high. Emancipation would have been triumphantly successful, even if it had not been so good a money speculation. The principle that, if the staple produce of the West Indies should be diminished, emancipation would be a failure, we have no sympathy with. No virtuous mind can be content to weigh the happiness of mankind against hogsheads of sugar and puncheons of rum. On this point we quote with great pleasure a passage from the pamphlet of Dr. Channing.

' What is the great end of civilized society ? Not coffee and sugar ; not the greatest possible amount of mineral, vegetable, and animal productions ; but the protection of the rights of all its members. The sacrifice of rights, especially of the dearest and most sacred, to increase of property is one of the most flagrant crimes of the social state. That every man should have his due, not that a few proprietors should riot on the toil, sweat, and blood of the many : this is the great design of the union of men into communities. Emancipation was not meant to increase the crops, but to restore to human beings their birthright, to give to every man the free use of his powers for his own and others good.

' What matters it that the staples of the West Indies are diminished ? Do the people there starve ? Are they driven by want to robbery ? Has the negro passed from the hands of the overseer into those of the hangman ? We learn from Mr. Gurney that the prophecies of ruin to the West Indies are fulfilled chiefly in regard to the prisons. These are in some places falling to decay, and everywhere have fewer inmates. And what makes this result more striking is, that, since emancipation, many offences formerly punished summarily by the master on the plantation, now fall under the cognizance of the magistrate, and are, of course, punishable by imprisonment. Do the freed slaves want clothing ? Do rags form the standard of emancipation ? We hear not only of decent apparel, but are told that negro vanity, hardly surpassed by that of the white dandy, suffers nothing from want of decoration or fashionable attire. There is not a sign that the people fare the worse for freedom. Enough is produced to give subsistence to an improved and cheerful population ; and what more can we desire ? In our sympathy with the rich proprietor shall we complain of a change which has secured to every man his rights, and to thousands, once trodden under foot, the comforts of life and the means of intellectual and moral progress ? Is it nothing that the old unfurnished hut of the slave is in many spots giving place to the comfortable cottage ? Is it nothing that in these cottages marriage is an indissoluble tie ?—that the mother presses her child to her heart as indeed her own ? Is it nothing that churches are springing up, not from the donations of the opulent, but from the hard earnings of the religious poor ? What if a few owners of sugar estates export less

than formerly? Are the many always to be sacrificed to the few? Suppose the luxuries of the splendid mansion to be retrenched. Is it no compensation that the comforts of the laborer's hut are increased? Emancipation was resisted on the ground that the slave, if restored to his rights, would fall into idleness and vagrancy, and even relapse into barbarism. But the emancipated negro discovers no indifference to the comforts of civilized life. He has wants various enough to keep him in action. His standard of living has risen. He desires a better lodging, dress, and food. He has begun too to thirst for accumulation. As Mr. Gurney says, 'he understands his interests as well as a Yankee.' He is more likely to fall into the civilized man's cupidity than into the sloth and filth of a savage. Is it an offset for all these benefits that the custom-house reports a diminution of the staples of slavery?"—*Emancipation*, pp. 18, 21.

Language like this would have been a sufficient vindication of a great measure of justice and humanity, under far different circumstances than those which have actually arisen. The issue, as it really appears, furnishes a new proof of the axiom, that what is morally wrong can never be politically right. Gratitude and joy may be abundantly cherished, while we read the following sketch by Mr. Gurney of the state of Jamaica, applicable as it no doubt is to the British West Indies at large.

'In the mean time, the imports of the island are rapidly increasing; trade improving; the towns thriving; new villages rising in every direction; property much enhanced in value; well-managed estates, productive and profitable; expenses of management diminished; short methods of labor adopted; provisions cultivated on a larger scale than ever; and the people, wherever they are properly treated, industrious, contented, and gradually accumulating wealth. Above all, education is rapidly spreading; the morals of the community improving; crime in many districts disappearing; and Christianity asserting her sway, with vastly augmented force, over the mass of the population. Cease from all attempts to oppose the current of justice and mercy—remove every obstruction to the fair and full working of freedom—and the bud of Jamaica's prosperity, already fragrant and vigorous, will soon burst into a glorious flower.'—*Winter in the West Indies*, pp. 173, 174.

In such a state of things as it has been our happiness to describe, one might have expected a chorus of universal gratulation and joy. The croakers, however, have still been busy in their vocation, and with them the covetous, who, by a modification of a well known maxim, are determined to think nothing gained while another shilling may be added to their wealth. We are told that a crying evil now exists in the West Indies, namely, a want of labor; and that there is no cure for it but a copious and continual immigration. Strong appeals have been

made on this subject, both to the government and the public, and large sums of money have been appropriated to the object by several of the colonial legislatures. The result is, that a considerable tide of emigration has set in towards Guiana, Trinidad, and Jamaica, both from the more thickly populated West India islands, and the United States. The movement has recently extended to Great Britain and Ireland, and is stretching to Sierra Leone. Our anxieties on this head are very limited, provided the government will not become an active party. Labor, like produce or money, is nothing more than an article in the market of the world, and it will sooner or later be found just where it is wanted. Its circulation cannot long be either forced or obstructed. If the West Indians really want labor, they will get it; if they do not, all that they can do to force emigration will be fruitless. When their labor market shall be glutted, it will as surely relieve itself by re-emigration, as a market glutted with any other article relieves itself by re-exportation. This matter must, and soon will, find its own level. While the colonies will spend money on it, agents may be hired, and emigrants may be procured, but the law which regulates demand and supply cannot be set aside, and will operate in spite of them.

The alleged scarcity of labor, however, is altogether fictitious. This topic was brought up in the course of the interview which Mr. Gurney had with the Governor of Jamaica, and we will fortify our opinion by the quotation of his.

‘On one point we somewhat differed. Sir Charles seems to be of the opinion, with many other persons, that the planting interest of Jamaica is suffering from the want of a larger population. That there is scope in that island for a great increase in the numbers of the people, is unquestionable; and we are by no means opposed to any reasonable scheme of immigration. But the result of our own inquiries is a conviction that the present population of Jamaica, if its force be but fairly applied under a just and wise management, will be found more than adequate to its present extent of cultivation; and that, as the population multiplies, under the righteous sway of freedom, the cultivation may be indefinitely increased.’—*lb. p. 170.*

There can be no reasonable doubt that there is labor enough in the West Indies, and that the immediate effect of immigration will be injurious, by diminishing the impulse, on the part of the planters, to a proper care of the native peasantry. As to the pretence set up by all West India writers in succession, and particularly labored by Mr. Greg in the pamphlet before us, that, by a copious immigration of laborers, British West India sugar may be rendered cheaper than that of Cuba and Porto Rico, and that immigration may thus put down slavery, nothing

than formerly? Are the many always to be sacrificed to the few? Suppose the luxuries of the splendid mansion to be retrenched. Is it no compensation that the comforts of the laborer's hut are increased? Emancipation was resisted on the ground that the slave, if restored to his rights, would fall into idleness and vagrancy, and even relapse into barbarism. But the emancipated negro discovers no indifference to the comforts of civilized life. He has wants various enough to keep him in action. His standard of living has risen. He desires a better lodging, dress, and food. He has begun too to thirst for accumulation. As Mr. Gurney says, 'he understands his interests as well as a Yankee.' He is more likely to fall into the civilized man's cupidity than into the sloth and filth of a savage. Is it an offset for all these benefits that the custom-house reports a diminution of the staples of slavery?—*Emancipation*, pp. 18, 21.

Language like this would have been a sufficient vindication of a great measure of justice and humanity, under far different circumstances than those which have actually arisen. The issue, as it really appears, furnishes a new proof of the axiom, that what is morally wrong can never be politically right. Gratitude and joy may be abundantly cherished, while we read the following sketch by Mr. Gurney of the state of Jamaica, applicable as it no doubt is to the British West Indies at large.

' In the mean time, the imports of the island are rapidly increasing; trade improving; the towns thriving; new villages rising in every direction; property much enhanced in value; well-managed estates, productive and profitable; expenses of management diminished; short methods of labor adopted; provisions cultivated on a larger scale than ever; and the people, wherever they are properly treated, industrious, contented, and gradually accumulating wealth. Above all, education is rapidly spreading; the morals of the community improving; crime in many districts disappearing; and Christianity asserting her sway, with vastly augmented force, over the mass of the population. Cease from all attempts to oppose the current of justice and mercy—remove every obstruction to the fair and full working of freedom—and the bud of Jamaica's prosperity, already fragrant and vigorous, will soon burst into a glorious flower.'—*Winter in the West Indies*, pp. 173, 174.

In such a state of things as it has been our happiness to describe, one might have expected a chorus of universal gratulation and joy. The croakers, however, have still been busy in their vocation, and with them the covetous, who, by a modification of a well known maxim, are determined to think nothing gained while another shilling may be added to their wealth. We are told that a crying evil now exists in the West Indies, namely, a want of labor; and that there is no cure for it but a copious and continual immigration. Strong appeals have been

made on this subject, both to the government and the public, and large sums of money have been appropriated to the object by several of the colonial legislatures. The result is, that a considerable tide of emigration has set in towards Guiana, Trinidad, and Jamaica, both from the more thickly populated West India islands, and the United States. The movement has recently extended to Great Britain and Ireland, and is stretching to Sierra Leone. Our anxieties on this head are very limited, provided the government will not become an active party. Labor, like produce or money, is nothing more than an article in the market of the world, and it will sooner or later be found just where it is wanted. Its circulation cannot long be either forced or obstructed. If the West Indians really want labor, they will get it; if they do not, all that they can do to force emigration will be fruitless. When their labor market shall be glutted, it will as surely relieve itself by re-emigration, as a market glutted with any other article relieves itself by re-exportation. This matter must, and soon will, find its own level. While the colonies will spend money on it, agents may be hired, and emigrants may be procured, but the law which regulates demand and supply cannot be set aside, and will operate in spite of them.

The alleged scarcity of labor, however, is altogether fictitious. This topic was brought up in the course of the interview which Mr. Gurney had with the Governor of Jamaica, and we will fortify our opinion by the quotation of his.

'On one point we somewhat differed. Sir Charles seems to be of the opinion, with many other persons, that the planting interest of Jamaica is suffering from the want of a larger population. That there is scope in that island for a great increase in the numbers of the people, is unquestionable; and we are by no means opposed to any reasonable scheme of immigration. But the result of our own inquiries is a conviction that the present population of Jamaica, if its force be but fairly applied under a just and wise management, will be found more than adequate to its present extent of cultivation; and that, as the population multiplies, under the righteous sway of freedom, the cultivation may be indefinitely increased.'—lb. p. 170.

There can be no reasonable doubt that there is labor enough in the West Indies, and that the immediate effect of immigration will be injurious, by diminishing the impulse, on the part of the planters, to a proper care of the native peasantry. As to the pretence set up by all West India writers in succession, and particularly labored by Mr. Greg in the pamphlet before us, that, by a copious immigration of laborers, British West India sugar may be rendered cheaper than that of Cuba and Porto Rico, and that immigration may thus put down slavery, nothing

can be more hollow or absurd. First, because sugar, like every other article, whatever it may cost to make it, will sell at the market price; and this can be reduced only by enlarged supply. Secondly, because the cost of making British West India sugar will never permit it to be sold at the price of Cuban. According to Mr. Greg, this cost is on the average 35s. 6d. per cwt., while that of Cuba is only 20s. Now how is it possible that any amount of immigration can reduce the cost of producing sugar in the British West Indies 15s. per cwt.? Immigration can reduce the cost of sugar growing only by reducing the wages of the laborer; and 15s. per cwt. is, we conceive, a very large proportion of the wages paid for this labor now. The notion that West Indians would like to see their sugar *selling* at the price of Cuban—22s. per cwt.—when the manufacture of it costs 35s., is utterly preposterous.

The real spring of the eagerness for immigration which has been shown by the West Indians, we take to be the high price of sugar, and the enormous profits attainable by the quick cultivation of new lands. Mr. Greg (an unexceptionable authority for our present purpose) estimates the cost of British West India sugar, including all expenses but the duty, at an average of 35s. 6d. per cwt., p. 91. Now the average price paid by the English purchaser for a good while past may be quoted at 55s. per cwt.: leaving the enormous profit of 20s. per cwt., or 20s. on 35s., for the producer. This is obviously the reason why the West Indians want a quick and large addition to their number of laborers. They wish to make hay while the sun shines. They have looked to immigration as affording them a facility for attaining this object, which they had not during slavery. They could not increase their number of slaves by importation, nor could they introduce free laborers into the same fields with slaves; but, when all were free, a new prospect opened itself. They saw in imagination fresh arrivals of men, and of men from Africa! There is something to us both pregnant and appalling, in the eagerness and the perseverance with which the West Indian legislatures and pamphleteers have directed their eyes to this desolated continent. They have implored the government to institute and conduct, on a large scale, a system of permanent 'free emigration' from Africa! We think we do them no injustice when we say that they were looking practically to a new slave-trade. The arguments by which their suit has been enforced, are just those which have been so many times advanced in defence of the slave-trade, with its greatest enormities. It is a nearer approach to such a measure than we can contemplate without uneasiness, that the British colony of Sierra Leone has been thrown open by our colonial minister to the immigrant speculators from the West

Indies. We have learnt with regret, that the situation of the Africans there is such as to render some of them importunate to leave it ; and, undoubtedly, as freemen, they have a right to do so. But, while the progress of this measure will be watched with anxiety by every friend of humanity, lest it should involve a repetition of such atrocities as were covered by the innocent name of 'free emigration' from Bengal to Mauritius, let the West Indians be assured that the slightest approach to a system of emigration from Africa which should extend beyond the limits of a British colony, would be viewed by the public with horror and indignation. The whole management of such a system must evidently fall into the hands of the slave-traders in Africa ; and it cannot be doubted for a moment but they would obtain their victims by the established modes of warfare, rapine, and fraud. It would be part and parcel of the African slave-trade. And yet it seems actually to have entered into the heads of the West Indians that this horrible traffic might now be revived, under the immediate sanction of the government and the abolitionists !

Brief Notices.

Railway Transit. A Letter to the Right Honorable Henry Labouchere, M. P., President of the Board of Trade. By Francis Roubiliac Conder, Civil Engineer. Weale : London. pp. 32.

This is a sensible and well written letter on an important subject ; important at all times, but just now more than ordinarily so. Though in our opinion the public during the late succession of railroad disasters was a good deal more 'frightened than hurt' (for the proportion of accidents as compared with the instances of safe conveyance was even then far less than under the old system of travelling) ; still there can be no doubt that sufficient mischief was done to justify the most rigorous inquiry into the past conduct of railroad directors and managers.

Mr. Conder contends, and we think with great propriety, that the magnitude and complication of public interests involved in railroads, render it highly desirable and even necessary that parliament should keep a vigilant eye upon them ; though, we presume, he would, like ourselves, plead only for that measure of interference which shall be just sufficient to secure the bodies of her majesty's subjects from mutilation and their pockets from imposition.

Though we must confess ourselves too little professional to form a decided judgment on some of the various suggestions the writer throws out for the more effective management of a line of railway, we

have no hesitation in saying that many of them commend themselves at once, and would tend, if universally adopted, to diminish to a great extent the chances of accident. We were particularly pleased with those which relate to the system of signals, and the construction of the locomotive itself. With respect to some minor points, we have doubts which we feel the less hesitation in expressing, as the writer modestly expresses some doubt about them himself.

His principal suggestion, however, is, if it can be adopted, a very important one. He proposes the formation, on each line, of what may be called a responsible transit-executive, composed of a chief-transit engineer with deputies under him. We have no doubt that some such system might be most advantageously acted upon, but, whether the present rates of traffic on any of the completed lines, are sufficient to enable railway companies to execute the project on the scale Mr. Conder recommends, is a question which we have no means of determining. He thinks it not justly liable to objection on this ground. We very cheerfully recommend the pamphlet to all who feel interested in this important subject.

Unitarianism Tried by Scripture and Experience; a Compilation of Treatises and Testimonies in Support of Trinitarian Doctrine and Evangelical Principles, with a General Introduction. By a Layman. Hamilton and Co.

We know of no better method of introducing this work to our readers than to lay before them the compiler's own account of it, assuring them that it is a fair and modest exposition of his views and motives, and that the merit of the publication, as a whole, fully bears out his statement. Of the pieces separately we need not here speak, as of some of them, when they appeared, we expressed our favorable opinion. The leading treatise in the volume is that of the late Rev. Joseph Freeston, entitled 'Why are you not a Socinian?' The other 'treatises and testimonies' are germane to the object of Mr. Freeston's work, and the writer observes 'while the present publication necessarily partakes of a *controversial* character, the compiler's principal aim has been to produce a volume, which, by the divine blessing, might operate either as a *dissuasive* or a *preservative* from the fatal errors which it is intended to expose.' This is amply confirmed by the table of contents, which exhibits, besides the work already mentioned, 'Joseph John Gurney on the Trinity—on Sin, original and actual—on the Deity of Christ—on Redemption. Narrative of the Renunciation of Unitarian, and the adoption of Trinitarian Sentiments, by the late J. E. Stock, M.D. of Bristol. The Essential passages of a Letter, addressed by the Rev. P. E. Butler, B.A. to the Unitarians of Ipswich on the occasion of the Rev. Joseph Ketley's Renunciation of Unitarianism. A Letter on the Atonement of Christ and the Expiatory Nature of his Sufferings, by W. T. Blair, Esq. Mrs. Hemans's Dying Testimony to the inestimable value and supporting efficacy of the Atonement. Extracts from Letters addressed by the Rev. Charles Leslie, M.A., to a Deist. Letter by the Chancellor D'Aguesseau on the Christian Mysteries. Lord Bacon's Theological Creed. Conclusion. Hymn to

the Trinity.' In the selection of these pieces the compiler has not confined himself to the productions of authors belonging to any single class of orthodox Christians. On the contrary, he has availed himself of what he conceived *just* expositions of those *essential* truths of revelation which it was his object to enforce, wheresoever he found them. From the miscellaneous character of his publication it will be evident that all the large divisions of the Christian church are consentient in their rejection of Unitarian views and sentiments, and unanimous in the maintenance of Trinitarian doctrine and evangelical principles.

As a minor matter; the aspect of the volume has not been disregarded. Dr. Johnson has justly remarked, 'Books that you may carry to the fire, and hold readily in your hand, are the most useful after all.' Such a book is the one now submitted to public notice. The introductory essay reflects great credit on the head and heart of the writer.

The Catholic Spirit of True Religion. pp. 376. London: Scott and Co. 1840.

We most heartily recommend this book to Christians of every denomination, in the hope it may prove a healing branch to the Marah of controversy.

Improvement of Affliction: A Practical Sequel to a Series of Meditations, entitled 'Comfort in Affliction.' By the Rev. James Buchanan, North Leith. Edinburgh: Johnstone. 1840.

We have read these discourses on affliction with much pleasure, and can cordially recommend them to such as are suffering under the painful dispensations of divine providence.

Letters of the Late John Love, D.D., Minister of Anderston, Glasgow.
Third Thousand. Glasgow: Collins. 1840.

These letters are characterized by a free communication of thought in an easy, elegant style. They are on a variety of subjects. And while they all show the enlarged scriptural views and sound judgment of the author, those on 'the Christian Ministry' are decidedly the most valuable, as on this topic he was eminently qualified to write, having passed through various changes during the term of fifty years' public devotedness to that work.

Literary Intelligence.

In the Press.

Letters from Italy, to a Younger Sister. By Catherine Taylor. Vol. 2.
Mr. Buckingham's 'America, Historical, Statistical, and Descriptive.' In 3 Octavo Vols. Illustrated with a Portrait of the Author, and Seventy Wood Engravings.

Summer and Winter in the Pyrenees, by the Author of 'The Women of England,' and 'Family Secrets.' In one volume, uniform in size, &c., with 'The Women of England.'

Just Published.

A History of British Starfishes and other Animals of the class Echinodermata. By Edward Forbes, M.W.S. Parts 4, 5, 6.

The World in the Year 1840. Retrospect of the chief Events, Civil, Political, and Religious, of the past Year, in Chronological order.

Some Inquiries into the Effects of Fermented Liquors. By a Water Drinker.

The Chinese as they are; their Moral, Social, and Literary Character, &c. By G. Tradescant Lay.

Memorials of South Africa. By Barnabas Shaw.

The Countess D'Auvergne, or Sufferings of the Protestants in France in the Sixteenth Century. By Catharine Ponsonby.

One Hundred Sonnets, Translated after the Italian of Petrarcha, with the Original Text, Notes, and a Life of Petrarch. By Susan Wollaston.

The North American Review. No. 110.

The History of the Reformation on the Continent. By George Washington, D.D., Dean of Durham. 3 vols.

The Latter Days of the Jewish Church and Nation as revealed in the Apocalypse. By Dominic M'Causland.

The Moral Government of God Elucidated and Enforced. By Thomas Kerns, M.D.

The Antiquities of Egypt, with a Particular Notice of those which Illustrate the Sacred Scriptures.

Retrospection, or the Light of Days gone by, and other Poems. By Rev. William Liddiard.

The Courts of Europe at the close of the last Century. By Henry Swinburne, Esq. Edited by Charles White, Esq. 2 vols.

A Dictionary of Science, Literature, and Art. Edited by W. T. Brande. Part 2.

History of Providence as Manifested in Scripture. By Alex. Carson, A.M. Seven Sermons. By Robert Russell, Minister of Wadhurst.

Memoir of John Huss. By Margaret Anne Wyatt.

Family Worship, a Series of Prayers, with Doctrinal and Practical Remarks adapted to the Services of Domestic Worship. By 180 Clergymen of the Church of Scotland.

Helen Fleetwood. By Charlotte Elizabeth.

Pictorial History of Palestine. Part 18.

Pictorial Edition of Shakspere. Winter's Tale. Part 30.

Baptism not Purification, in Reply to President Beecher. By Alex. Carson, M.A.

The Restoration of the Jews to their own Land, connected with their future Conversion and the final Blessedness of our Earth. By Rev. E. Bickersteth.

Priscilla, the Helper; a Memoir of Mrs. Rowton, of Coventry. By John Gregg Hewlett.

Works of De Foe. Part 17. Edited by W. Hazlitt.

The Jubilee Memorial, commemorating the Rev. W. Jay's Fifty Years' Ministry at Argyle Chapel, Bath.

My Life. By an Ex-Dissenter.

On Heroes, Hero-worship, and the Heroic in History. Six Lectures. By Thomas Carlyle.

A Treatise on the Dominion of Sin and Grace. By Dr. Owen. With Notes and an Appendix. By William Innes.